



The Dublin Review

OCT., NOV., DEC., 1919

IRISH PAGES FROM THE POSTBAGS *of* MANNING, CULLEN & GLADSTONE

I

IT is noticeable of the historical *impasse* that lies between England and Ireland that its political depth cannot be bridged by religious sympathy. Between Catholic England and Catholic Ireland there has been little peace. Since Emancipation, English and Irish Catholics have collided in Parliament and in Rome, in imperial and social questions, in their attitude to the Sovereign, and in the antechambers of the Holy Father. This lamentable state of affairs must be attributed more to prominent laymen than to clerics. The English Hierarchy have stood for peace among Catholics, and, therefore, for peace throughout the English-speaking world. The See of Westminster is not unprovidentially placed at the meeting-point of Irish and English interests. Cardinal Bourne has ratified the Manning policy toward Labour and Ireland. The speech of his American delegate, the Bishop of Northampton, is remembered in Washington where Mr. Balfour's is forgotten. Some of Manning's policies have been shown by time to be wholly wrong. But others have shed the righteous glamour of the prophet who is rejected in his country. Manning's apocalyptic fear and distrust of Germany, from a purely spiritual outlook, is, perhaps, the one which most

Letters of Manning,

commends itself to his fellow-countrymen to-day. But he was right on Labour, as Benjamin Tillett lives to testify. And he was right in his whole attitude to Ireland, whatever went awry in the different schemes to which he lent a hand, regardless of the inevitable singeing. The following correspondence with Cardinal Cullen and Mr. Gladstone, collected from various sources—from St. Mary of the Angels', Bayswater, from Hawarden Castle, and from Archbishop's House, Dublin—deal with the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, with the Irish University question, and with Fenianism.

Though the clouds of controversy have passed away, the time has hardly come yet to give an enduring account of Cardinal Paul Cullen, Ultramontane and Constitutionalist, who ruled the Irish bishops, and therefore Ireland, for a quarter of a century. No Irishman since O'Connell has been more bitterly attacked by English and Irish alike. He warred with uncondescending grace against Dublin Castle, the Fenians, the Gallican spirit, and Archbishop Whately. Though he crushed the rising Nationalism of Ireland, yet at heart he was Irish of the Irish, as is revealed in his letters to Manning, who allowed himself to be instructed on all the sides of the Irish case. Though he condemned the Fenians, and even inspired Manning's condemnation of them, he snatched the Fenian General Bourke from the gallows on the eve of his execution. The executive at Dublin Castle were too startled to resist. Fenian and Orangeman feared him alike. Manning's attitude towards Ireland was more sympathetic; but he did not share the Irish Cardinal's hereditary and justified suspicion of British government in all their pomps and works. However, he allowed Manning to act and, in the good sense, to intrigue for him at Westminster on vital questions. The great inside part the two archbishops took in the work of Irish Disestablishment has not yet been made clear. When a double failure attended their effort to secure an Irish University, Manning bore the blame, though it embroiled him with both Gladstone and Disraeli.

Cullen, and Gladstone

In March, 1865, Gladstone sounded the tocsin of Irish Disestablishment, and then Manning wrote: "I read your speech on the Irish Church, which set me musing and forecasting. It was a real grapple with the question. We were once united on the basis of your book on Church and State. You have departed, if not from that basis, at least from the application. Your whole policy is the separation of Church and State." Manning's own policy was to arrange a union between the English and Irish bishops, at least in theory, which could be consummated in practice by a simple league between himself and Cardinal Cullen. Their combined action to obtain Disestablishment seemed menaced by the outbreak of Fenianism, to which curiously Gladstone attributed the eventual passing of Disestablishment. Was that possibly to disguise the successful persistence and influence of the archbishops on himself? It was, perhaps, wiser to say he was afraid of Fenians than on whispering terms with Manning and Cullen. Gladstone's policy was straightforward enough and he was justified in dealing with the archbishops with his left hand while his right swayed the Commons, especially as their advice was moderate and almost supernaturally wise when they refused to accept glebes and endowments out of the spoils of a rival Church.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO ARCHBISHOP CULLEN

December 8th, 1865.—I believe we have such an identity of principles that we need only a fuller and more personal knowledge of each other to renew the union which once partially existed, and to make it both broader and more enduring.

December 8th, 1865.—My belief is that the bishops in England would desire to avoid contact with all political parties and to maintain a perfect independence, requiring of all Governments two things: (1) A cessation of the Anti-Roman policy in Italy; (2) justice to Catholics in the full sense, especially in education and the treatment of our prisons and poor.

Letters of Manning,

February 5th, 1866.—Your Grace will be happy to know that the Fenian prisoners in Pentonville have asked for Mass ; and the Government has granted it. This is a strange victory on which I make no comment, except “Thank God !” But it will console your Grace for the poor men. There is no doubt that the attitude of your Grace and the clergy of Ireland at this moment has done immense good, and has exhibited the Catholic Church in its true light as the source of public order and the upholder of authority. I have never known a more propitious moment to make the Government feel that they cannot do without us, but that our co-operation is to be obtained only by never outraging us again, not by proposing to buy it, not by paying money. The article in *The Times* was simply brutal. I cannot but think that a good opportunity will arise for some such declaration as the German bishops made in 1848, by which we may show that we uphold Government neither for what we can get, nor for anything we fear, but for what we are ; and that we can never rest till we are in perfect equality with our fellow subjects.

April 3rd, 1866.—Next week the bishops meet in London as usual. Might it not be well if we were to issue a letter to the Faithful, exhorting them to peace ? We might express our sense of the sufferings of Ireland, and of the duty of a just legislation to remove them ; and also show that the same principles which are subversive of the Government of the Holy See are subversive of all Governments, and that the principle of loyalty to the former includes also loyalty to the latter. Would our doing so hinder, or help in any way, the position of the bishops in Ireland ? I shall feel grateful for a few words as soon as your Grace can give them.

April 26th, 1866.—The meeting of the bishops passed off very well ; and they would be most glad to unite in any co-operation with their brethren in Ireland. I may add, in confidence, that they expressed a very strong feeling of disapproval of the conduct of the *Tablet* towards your Grace, and other Irish bishops. I think I may say

Cullen, and Gladstone

that, if we could devise some occasion for a joint act, they are all ready to unite in it. I did not find some of them inclined to the Pastoral I sent your Grace. One reason alleged was that it seemed to admit the existence of disaffection among our flocks. I, therefore, did not press it. But could we not draw up a declaration based on these two principles : (1) The integrity of the United Kingdom ; (2) the admission of Catholics to perfect equality of rights and privileges.

May 29th, 1866.—I yesterday heard with great delight what I assume to be the reason of your passing through London. I have long felt, and often said, that for your own sake, as an old and tried servant of the Holy See, and for the sake of Ireland, which would thereby receive a token of the Holy Father's love, and also a glory in the sight of the world, I desired to see you in the Sacred College. Believe me that, though you have older and closer friends, there is hardly anyone who, on public grounds, rejoices more truly than I do. I trust many long years may be granted you to hold firmly the helm which is in your hands. We are in stormy days, and at any moment may be *ludibrium ventis*.

CARDINAL CULLEN TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

February 7th, 1867.—Your address at Birmingham was very much liked here in Dublin. I thought it was exceedingly good, and well calculated to soften Protestant prejudices. I fear that, in Ireland, we shall get very little from the present Government. Lord Naas and Lord Derby appear disposed to maintain the mixed system. In ordinary schools there is scarcely any mixture ; but the mixed system is fully carried out in the Model Schools and Queen's Colleges, with which we can never be satisfied. Miss Whateley, in the *Life* of her father, the late archbishop, has injured the mixed system very much in the eyes of Catholics ; but the Protestants, who formerly opposed that system, are now clamouring for its continuation. They now think that Dr. Whateley was

Letters of Manning,

wise in his generation. Your Grace spoke rather too favourably of our Poor Law Guardians. In general, they treat the poor badly. Wherever the Protestants have a strong majority they give scarcely anything to the Catholic chaplains. Even in the very severe weather which we had, they could not be induced in this Union (North Dublin), to give any outdoor relief. However, where the Catholics are pretty strong on the boards a good deal of liberality is displayed. In Limerick (where there is only one Presbyterian pauper), Dr. Wilson, the moderator of the Synod of Munster, applied for, and got, £20 per annum for attending him. In the north they would scarcely allow the same sum for attending fifty Catholics.

February 8th, 1867.—I have heard that Father Lavelle has been writing to your Grace on the subject of Fenianism. He did a great deal of mischief by encouraging that movement in the beginning, but he managed to keep out of the clutches of the law. It appears to me that it would not be safe to correspond with so reckless a gentleman, or to notice him at all. If there be any stir on the part of the Irish in Glasgow, or in any other town in Scotland, in favour of Fenianism, it is probably due to the letters of Father Lavelle.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

February 10th, 1867.—I will take care not to be led into any correspondence with Father Lavelle. As soon as I saw *The Connaught Patriot* I thought I saw his hand in it. I had the honour of being there named and denounced with your Eminence. We were described as driving the Fenians from their faith. I made it a reserved case last December year; and since then I do not think I have had to give faculties more than fifty or sixty times at most; from which I infer either that the Fenians do not come to their duties, or that they follow Father Lavelle's theology and do not confess their union with the Fenian Society. Probably both are true.

Cullen, and Gladstone

CARDINAL CULLEN TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

February 13th, 1867.—I am sorry to see that Father Lavelle had written so violent a letter to your Grace. If the principles laid down in that letter were carried into effect no Government could exist. Happily, no newspaper, except *The Patriot*, publishes Lavelle's effusions, and they cannot do much mischief. It is about six years since he commenced writing such letters to me; but I have never taken any public notice of them. Father Lavelle feels greatly hurt when his letters are left unnoticed. It would be a great triumph for him if he could induce a bishop or any person of importance to enter the lists with him. The only way to defeat him is to pass him over in silence. We have great reports to-day about a Fenian movement in Chester. I have heard it stated, on good authority, that the great rising was nothing more or less than a crowd of unarmed workmen who were going to witness a prize-fight, and who were obliged to travel some distance to avoid the police. I suppose before night the truth will be known. Anyhow, I think Ireland will take no part in such a foolish movement. Indeed, it appears that our Fenians are now getting more common sense. The only evil effect we have now to apprehend is the neglect of the Sacraments. However, I must say that there were never so many penitents at the confessional and so many communicants in our Churches as at present, notwithstanding all the Fenian agitation.

April 8th, 1867.—Will your Grace allow me to take the liberty of making an observation on a passage of your beautiful Pastoral, where you state that, if Ireland continue to progress for twenty years to come as she has in the last twenty, she will be like the provinces of the Rhine, or like Belgium. Unfortunately, the last twenty years have pressed very heavily on Ireland. We have lost about three millions of our population, about a million acres of land has been withdrawn from cultivation, our principal towns have been decaying, hundreds of villages have disappeared, more than three hundred thousand cottages of

Letters of Manning,

the poor have been levelled to the ground. Now, if things be as I think they are, and were they to continue their downward course for another quarter of a century, I fear the country would be more like Algiers or Palestine. Until something effectual shall be done for the country, it will be impossible to put down Fenians. The total dis-endowment of the Protestant Church would put an end to a grievance and an insult.

August 17th, 1867.—The Government appear disposed to give some part of the property to the Catholic bishops and priests. In my opinion the proposed division of the property of the Church would contribute to uphold Protestantism in Ireland, producing the same result as the suppression of ten bishoprics by Stanley in 1836. Besides, if we accepted any endowment, all the Nonconformists, who now having nothing to say to us, would assail us with great violence and soon succeed in depriving us of anything we might have obtained. Probably, too, the poor Catholics, now so generous, would withdraw their oblations on seeing us accept a portion of the Church property which they abhor, so that in a short time we might be reduced to the condition of the poor priests in Italy. Finally, if Parliament undertakes to divide the spoils of the Establishment, I am sure they would not give us anything worth accepting.

II

It is easy to be wise after the event, and review the morality of the Fenians. Both archbishops took the sternest view that Catholic doctrine would permit them. But Cardinal Cullen failed to see that the Dublin confessionals were full, because of the Fenian movement, and not, as he wrote, "notwithstanding all this Fenian agitation." Manning laid down that Fenianism and Mazzinianism were convertible terms, and enjoyed the discomfiture he caused to English Conservatives who were then egging Mazzini and Garibaldi, that Father of Italian Sinn Fein, against the Pope. When Fenians joined the Papal army, and died for the cause of Canon

Cullen, and Gladstone

Law and Order in Italy, he could not forbear to preach at their London requiem from the text, "We fools counted their life madness and their end without honour. Behold, they are numbered among the children of God, and their lot is among the Saints." His voice was as of one crying amid a wilderness of criticism and railing. He was not afraid to tell England that God would accept the Zouaves' "life blood as an offering to Himself." He appealed to Englishmen to perceive that these men were martyrs, and not hirelings. He contrasted the armies of Piedmont, waiting for the Revolution to accomplish itself within the Pontifical borders, with the neutrality of America in discouraging the Fenian descent into Canada. Manning could not be contented with mere repression of Irish turbulence. He became affected at once by the piety of the Fenians in prison and the heroism of the Irish soldiers in Italy. His heart yearned to them as that of a pitying parent.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

December 20th, 1867.—I have been, and am, in great anxiety. You know that our people look to us for everything. The Irish look to their clergy as Englishmen look to Parliament, and Irishmen look to us now with a keener feeling, because they have almost given up to look for justice from England. I cannot overstate the danger of this despair. The public papers, above all *The Times*, have driven this onward like a fierce wind. Their very praise of the Catholic bishops for their firm attitude at this time lessens the sympathy of our people. And that because it renders us suspect of the English policy of contempt and coercion. Your bold and just speech gives me both hope and strength. I can speak, and will speak, to our people in your words. But I neither can, nor will, in any other. Fill Lancashire with the spirit of your speech, and fill Irishmen with the hope of justice, and there is peace before us. If this fail, God only knows our future.

February 11th, 1868.—Ireland is becoming Republican, with not Red but American Republicanism. A calm and

Letters of Manning,

reasonable preference for the civil and religious equality of America, rather than the irritating and impoverishing inequalities of the United Kingdom, is spreading. This is invading even the clergy, and if it establish itself in the pastors you will have lost the people. I see no hope (for martial law and another '98 is not hope) but in gaining the confidence of the Irish. You can do it !

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

May 15th, 1868.—Late events have placed me in a difficulty as regards Mr. Disraeli ; and I have not liked to communicate with him lest he should take it as a request, and so lay me under a difficulty towards him. Nevertheless, I will obtain such information as I can, and report without delay. I will also take care that your Eminence's suggestion as to the Irish Church endowments shall reach Mr. Gladstone. Great progress has been made which cannot be wholly lost ; we shall have a hard fight.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

March 24th, 1868.—It is no question of religion, but of political justice. Anyone who believes the Protestant Church in Ireland to be the true religion must desire to see it disembarrassed of an injustice to a whole people, which would turn their hearts even from the twelve apostles. It is the most imperial question of our times, and the necessary preparation for a new civil order.

March 28th, 1868.—The Irish Establishment is a great wrong. It is the cause of division in Ireland, of alienation between Ireland and England. It embitters every other question. Even the land question is exasperated by it. All relations of life are tainted by it. The fatal ascendancy of race over race is unspeakably aggravated by the ascendancy of religion over religion. If this wrong were righted, everything else would be easier. I don't think it a leap in the dark, but a step onward into the light.

Cullen, and Gladstone

LORD GREY TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

March 28th, 1868 (Private).—I beg to send you here-with a copy of a pamphlet I have published on the subject of the Irish Church. In doing so allow me to entreat you to give it your serious consideration and to use your great influence with the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland to induce them, if possible, to refrain from hastily declaring themselves hostile to the settlement I have proposed. I am strongly convinced that this mode of settling a very difficult question would be strictly fair and greatly for the advantage of all parties in Ireland. I am also of opinion that if not met by an expression of disapproval on the part of the Roman Catholics, it is probable that such a measure might be passed. I have good grounds for believing that many of the ablest members of the Protestant Churches, both of England and of Ireland, feel that the time is come when this question must be settled; and would not object to the scheme I have suggested. With their support, and that of the Roman Catholics, I think it might be carried, notwithstanding the opposition it would encounter from the most violent of the Dissenters and from those who still retain the old "No Popery" feeling. I am persuaded that it is only by some such compromise being carried by the aid of all friends of peace, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics, that a most bitter contest can be averted with all the evils it would bring in Ireland and on the Empire.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

March 30th, 1868 (Confidential).—The enclosed letter from Lord Grey will explain itself. I send, also, his pamphlet which accompanied it. I have given him no opinion; and I refrain from forming one till I know your Eminence's mind. I perceive that men's minds are tending to some such settlement as Lord Grey and Mr. Bright have proposed. Mr. Gladstone, ten days ago, referred approvingly to Mr. Bright's plan, namely, (1)

Letters of Manning,

Disestablishment ; (2) Disendowment ; (3) Proportional *lump* sums to the three bodies ; (4) complete independence of all three from State control and influence. If your Eminence would kindly tell me whether, and in what degree, any such plan is possible, I should be greatly obliged. The excitement here is considerable. I am very glad to see that in Dublin the good people are praying.

April 2nd, 1868.—My own impressions, subject to correction, are as follows : (1) That no endowment can be accepted by the Church in Ireland which would even *seem* to be in violation of the noble Declaration of October last. (2) That to accept such endowment would destroy not only the independence and dignity of the Church, but the moral power and character of all concerned. (3) That to accept anything, the benefit of which would terminate in the clergy, would be most dangerous ; inasmuch as the people would feel that the clergy had been caring for themselves. (4) That though logically, and really, the clergy might remain independent, the people would not believe it. The unity, trust and affection of the people is of a higher order, and more precious than all the world. (5) That if any endowment be accepted it ought to be so applied that the people may be the *first*, and the *chief*, visibly and sensibly to feel the benefit : and that, not circuitously by relieving them of their contributions, but directly in its immediate uses. (6) That, subject to this condition, there is no reason why some scheme, not Lord Grey's, but like Mr. Bright's, may not be modified and accepted ; and in the accepting, purified of all inconsistency, State dependence, and apparent self-interest. (7) That by this course the Church in Ireland will put no bar to the settlement of this vast question, the greatest since the Tudor tyranny, because it is the pulling down of one whole wing of the Royal Supremacy ; and its moral reaction over the three Kingdoms is inconceivably great and far-reaching, both in enfeebling Protestantism and elevating the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church in Ireland would stand

Cullen, and Gladstone

ready for either path, either complete disendowment or such endowment as is purified both of taint and danger. What such uses would be I hardly venture now to say ; but charity, and Catholic education, ecclesiastical buildings, and the purchase of land for pious and charitable purposes terminating in the poor, would be obvious.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

April 8th, 1868.—You will be glad to know that the Cardinal writes from Dublin : “The victory was great indeed ; but it is necessary that the supporters of the Resolutions should follow it up and turn it to practical purposes.” The Cardinal goes on to say : “I think all the bishops are persuaded that, were we to consent to a share of the spoils of the Establishment, our doing so would contribute to prevent any legislation. Our best policy is to adhere to the recommendations in our Resolutions that the rights of the poor should be attended to in disposing of the property of the Establishment.” I cannot help adding this last passage : “The Faithful in Dublin, and especially the nuns and clergy, devoted last Friday, the Feast of the Seven Dolours, to prayer and supplication, and I am sure their prayers and the intercession of the Queen of Sorrows contributed to the attainment of the victory.”

April 17th, 1868.—I have been much struck by the absence of all serious opposition to your policy, and by the extensive and various support given to it in England and Scotland. It is not so much a change in men’s thoughts, but a revelation of what they have been thinking. What a course Disraeli has taken ! It must weaken him and his party.

May 8th, 1868.—Let the endowments be put overboard half-way between Galway and New York rather than mix them up with the question of your Resolutions.

December 4th, 1868.—I fully recognize the prudence of our not meeting now. All is changed since I wrote. Had you then been what you are I should not have written. And so you are at the end men live for ; but

Letters of Manning,

not, I believe, the end for which you have lived. It is strange so to salute you, but very pleasant. I take much consolation from the fact that what has made you so is a cause in which my whole heart can go with you. There are many prayers put up among us for you, and mine are not wanting.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

Holy Saturday, 1869.—Allow me to say with what satisfaction I have noted the course taken by your Eminence towards Lord Spencer; and also your attitude towards public events. I believe them to be both wise and courageous, and conducive to the best interests of Ireland. I may add that I know them to be approved in Rome. Mr. Gladstone has only done what I knew he would do; but he has done it well and boldly. The question is morally settled. Nothing but delay can now be attempted by the Opposition.

CARDINAL CULLEN TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

June 8th, 1869.—I regret to state that I have been informed that of our very few Catholic peers, Lord G—— is gone over to London to vote against Mr. Gladstone's Church Bill. Such a course adopted by a Catholic lord will give great offence to the Catholics, and the noble lord's name will be held in the greatest opprobrium by our people. Perhaps your Grace could exercise some influence over Lord G—— in this case, and prevent him from bringing disgrace and ruin on himself and family. His lordship is a very good man; it is difficult to understand how he can make up his mind to support the Irish Establishment. It would be a great charity to keep him right. I fear the Lords will reject the Irish Church Bill. If so, we shall have unpleasant work for some time longer in Ireland. If Mr. Gladstone resigns, and lets the Tories in again, it is much to be feared that we shall have serious

Cullen, and Gladstone

disturbances. I hope nothing will induce him to take so ruinous a step.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

July 12th, 1869.—I write one line to thank your Eminence for your letter of last week, of which Mr. Gladstone is by this time well informed. Every day I am 'pressed to say whether you would accept glebes. I answer, if unconditionally given, and if not a part of a scheme of concurrent endowment. But if the present Bill be risked by the proposal, no. Would your Eminence send me a word of guidance confidentially?

CARDINAL CULLEN TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

July 13th, 1869.—I am sure, if the project of concurrent endowment is carried out, it will be made a pretext for annoying the Catholics and subjecting them to laws such as have been enacted for the management of Protestant glebes. It will also be a means of setting priest against priest. If the concurrent endowment were adopted, it would be difficult for us to maintain the voluntary system.

MR. GLADSTONE TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

July 13th, 1869 (Private).—It was matter for argument whether, inasmuch as the glebe houses were to be surrendered to the Established Church on very favourable terms, some corresponding concession was not required by the principle of equality which was to govern the winding-up arrangements. But the vote of last night—which gave to three denominations, leaving 100,000 Methodists, however, in the cold, glebes as well as houses—is, or, rather, would be, a flat violation of all our pledges to the country. In your late note you have expressed so strongly and clearly your idea of the basis on which the late remarkable co-operation of the Liberal

Letters of Manning,

majority has been founded that I see you think, like me, it is the only possible basis. The question whether any other basis would be abstractedly better is a question at this moment for debating societies. On Thursday, at a quarter-past five, I shall move, please God, to restore to the Preamble the words of our solemn compact with the people. I have no doubt of the thorough soundness of the body of your co-religionaries. As far as numbers are concerned, we shall on this particular question have enough and to spare. But I think you will share my hope that, with a view to unbroken moral force, there shall be no defections. I therefore mention as rumour, for which I cannot be personally responsible, and yet not an idle rumour, three men, very different one from the other, who on this occasion would, I believe, be the better for a little confirmation in case you should have any discreet opportunity of conveying it—Moore, Blake, and Blennerhasset. After dealing with the Concurrent Endowment by the Preamble we shall proceed, I trust, to knock down the rest of the House of Cards.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

July 13th, 1869.—I have to-day spoken with Blennerhasset in the sense that it will be better to lose the Bill than accept Concurrent Endowment. Yesterday I said the same to Mr. Moore. After my conversation I went to the House to see Mr. Cogan and Mr. Maguire. Mr. Moore had told me that, with few exceptions, all the Irish members wished for the glebes. For myself I had rather see the Church in Ireland left to work out its own re-endowment. If, since 1800, it has spent on churches, etc., £5,000,000, in twenty years it will have its glebes, if, indeed, it wants them. But, in truth, glebes are of less use to us than to others. I do not believe that the Lords have made any impression on the mind of the country by their amendments. They are too transparently the work of the Ascendancy Party at bay, and making terms of surrender at the least pecuniary loss. But if in any thing the Government departs, or seems to

Cullen, and Gladstone

depart, from the known basis, which has been tacitly recognized, I fear the Lords will set the Government and the country at variance, and profit by the disunion.

July 14th, 1869.—The old endowments cannot be applied to religious purposes without breaking peace, wounding charity and hindering religion. In good men like Lord Harrowby it is a mistaken piety; in Aubrey de Vere it is poetry, to wish for their application to religious uses. Let all that can be applied to charitable uses sensible to the whole of Ireland. Finally, if any part can be so applied as to relieve the Land Question, it is given to the poor.

July 24th, 1869.—It will give to our divided and hitherto irreconcilable population the unity which France has long had, and Germany is on the way to form for itself. My joy over the event is not only as a Catholic—though that must be, as it ought to be, my highest motive—but as an Englishman to whom, as I remember you once saying, the old English monarchy is dear next after the Catholic Church. But at this time I will only add that I may wish you joy on personal reasons. I could hardly have hoped that you could so have framed, mastered and carried through the Bill from first to last so complete, so unchanged in identity of purpose and detail, and, let me add, with such unwearying and sustained self-control and forbearance. The three atmospheres of prudence are, perhaps, now sufficiently lifted off to give an opportunity of seeing you before you leave London.

MR. GLADSTONE TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

July 24th, 1869.—Your last note was of much value, and showed me at once with what an accurate eye you had measured the situation. But I cannot thank you for it alone; I am much indebted to you on behalf of the Government for the firm, constant and discriminating support which you have afforded to our Bill during the arduous conflict now happily concluded. Should you happen to write to Cardinal Cullen, pray be kind enough

Letters of Manning,

to ask him to accept a similar tribute of acknowledgment from me.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

July 25th, 1869.—I am sure that Mr. Gladstone would be much gratified by any expressions on your Eminence's part, as the chief Pastor of Ireland. He has acted with great uprightness and great firmness. Let me give you and Ireland joy at this event. I feel it as a common joy in which I share. May God as greatly console Ireland as England has greatly afflicted it. Let me thank you for your Eminence's last letter, of which I made good use.

III

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

May 19th, 1871.—Yesterday I had a long conversation with two very advanced Irish politicians. They assured me that, three years ago, the desire for separation from England was greatly in the ascendant; that now the desire is equally strong for the integrity of the Empire. They ascribed this to a revived confidence in Parliament, and that to your two chief Irish measures. You have fairly earned this, which no English statesman has yet deserved.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

October 11th, 1871.—And now I wish for your Eminence's counsel on a grave matter—I mean the Home Rule movement. It is already astir in London, and the *Vindicator* is set up here to unite all Irish Catholics for its support. I will frankly open my mind to your Eminence about it. In the *personnel* I see somewhat to make one cautious and anxious. I see the danger that what begins in *Home Rule* may end in some wild excess. It may be that some already look beyond it. But so long as the programme of Imperial integrity is maintained, I

Cullen, and Gladstone

am fully prepared for Home Rule. If the programme be violated, I should oppose that violation, and not Home Rule. I am strongly convinced that political questions ought to be Imperial. But that social, moral, religious, industrial questions (*servatis servandis*) ought to be local in the three kingdoms. I shall be compelled to speak, and I wish to speak, word for word as your Eminence does. Any discrepancy might be hurtful. Our agreement may, perhaps, have its good effect.

CARDINAL CULLEN TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

October 13th, 1871.—In answer to your Grace's letter, I beg to state that I have determined to have nothing to do with the Home Rule movement for the present. The principal leaders in the movement here are professors of Trinity College, who never heretofore manifested any good feeling towards the people of Ireland; and Orangemen, who are still worse. Their object appears to be to put out the present Ministry, and get Disraeli into power, when they will all give up the present agitation. The line of action I am determined to follow is to look on until we shall know more about the tendencies of the system and its leaders.

• ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

October 14th, 1871.—Your Eminence's letter is all I need. I shall carefully follow the same course. Already I have been asked to allow the use of the schools for meetings. The obvious fear is the International. "All rivers run into the sea."

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

August 23rd, 1872.—I am altogether unable to maintain the justice of our holding Ireland, if the Pope had not a just sovereignty over Rome. My belief is that the action of Italy upon Rome is like the action of America

Letters of Manning,

upon Ireland, the cause of overthrow to an unarmed sovereignty as the latter is perpetual embarrassment and odious oppression to a powerful one. I have never heard this argument met by reason, but only by Sir Robert Inglis's 25,000 men, or by a raid of Lowland Scots from Belfast to Cork. But this is the policy of Russia in Poland. If you wish to know the will of Ireland, ask the Irish in our Colonies and in the United States. You will never get it in Ireland, with 30,000 English and Scotch bayonets. The political representation of Ireland by thirty Catholic members out of a hundred is like the Roman plebiscite. Yet I believe our sovereignty to be rightful. Let the next Election be taken in the presence of 200,000 American troops. However, I will say no more, for the world is past reasoning. It is going on to its catastrophe, and nothing under God can stay it. Do not believe me, if you like. But do not disregard me. Steer your course as if the rocks I have laid down in the chart were as certain as you may, perhaps, think them to be moonshine.

MR. GLADSTONE TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

August 26th, 1872.—Your argument from Ireland does not hit me, for I have not maintained the doctrine that Italy was entitled to absorb the Roman States against the will of their inhabitants. But over and above this I cannot accept your belief as to the people of Ireland. I know of no proof that they desire separation from this country. We shall know more on this subject, perhaps, after an Election under the Ballot Act. The largest demand ever made in Ireland, as far as I know, except the Fenian demand, has acknowledged the Sovereignty of the Crown, and has aimed at no more than is now enjoyed by States of the Austrian Empire. Even this I do not know to be the desire of the people of Ireland generally. Nor have I ever cast on America the responsibility connected with Fenianism. I believe the American influence, as it was (for it is now nearly dead) to be the *contrecoup* of an influence having its root and seat in

Cullen, and Gladstone

Ireland itself. The bayonets in Ireland are Irish as well as English and Scotch ; but I know of no influence which they do, or can, exercise on the free expression of opinion.

IV

A parallel development of the correspondence of the strangely assorted Three touched the Irish Education question. The letters of the Irish Cardinal, the Archbishop of Westminster, and the Liberal Premier, survive. Disraeli, who at times completed the quartet, preferred to see Manning personally rather than to exchange letters. But the Irish University question ended by estranging Manning from both Gladstone and Disraeli. Only the superb mollitude which archbishops bear to each other prevented a breach with Cardinal Cullen, when the Irish bishops could not accept the arrangements and possibilities Manning had built up between them and two successive English Premiers, of whom he noted Disraeli lost his head but not his temper, while Gladstone lost both !

CARDINAL CULLEN TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

August 17th, 1867.—I am altogether in favour of a Catholic University with an independent Charter for itself, and altogether under Catholic control. I think this is the desire of all our bishops with the exception, perhaps, of Dr. Moriarty. I am aware that some of the Catholic M.P.'s are opposed to this plan, and that they would prefer the system of the London University, with a mixed board, deputed to examine the students without taking into account where they studied. An attempt to carry out this system was made by the late Government by granting what was called the supplementary charter to the Queen's University. That grant pleased no party. If your Grace could suggest any way of proceeding likely to ensure our success, I would be most obliged if you would put me in possession of your views.

Letters of Manning,

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

January 14th, 1868.—The day I received your last, and the copy of Lord Derby's letter, I wrote to Mr. Disraeli. Yesterday I saw him for a moment. He told me that he had acted on my letter, and said that he would see me again.

January 24th, 1868.—I know that the worst and most tyrannical enemies of Ireland and the Catholic Church are now urging endowment of the clergy to buy them and ruin their influence, and the union of the people and their pastors. They will even go the length of forcing it and leaving it to time to take effect. We cannot be too outspoken or too prompt. I have nothing good to report about the Charter, and I expect little from these men. What your Eminence says is certain. All places are filling up with partisans, and mischief is laid up for twenty years.

February 20th, 1868.—If the Government were to propose to Charter the Catholic University without giving endowment, would it not be best to accept it? Would not endowment come by force of events? And if they were to propose the admission of laymen into the Government, is it not possible to reserve the supreme control of the bishops over all its system? As I am likely to be asked these questions I should like to know what you would answer.

February 21st, 1868 (Private).—For reasons which I am not able to state I think it is of urgent importance that the Archbishop of Cashel and the Bishop of Ferns should come over to London, if possible next week. If both cannot, I hope one will; but both would be better. I hope your Eminence will kindly excuse this, and make it known only to the two bishops, as I should think much harm might arise to us by any public notice of this letter.

February 29th, 1868.—I hardly like to express any opinion contrary to that of the Archbishop of Cashel. But I am not able to concur in the view that a Charter without endowment ought to be refused. Your Eminence

Cullen, and Gladstone

may, however, be assured that in all this I simply repeat what I understand to be the judgment of the Irish bishops. Of one thing I am as certain as I can be, namely, that the hope of a Charter from the Liberal Party is not to be counted on. I still hope the Irish bishops may reserve their claim to endowment, and accept the Charter, which will give legal existence to the University.

March 11th, 1868.—The Government propose both Charter and Endowment. I trust this will get over our difficulty. The Government is willing to treat the details. And I think they can be so moulded as to make them possible to accept. I feel that this is our moment. A Reformed Parliament would almost certainly throw open all education. I have written to-day strongly to Mr. Gladstone, begging him not to obstruct the Charter.

March 14th, 1868.—I have just now had an interview with Mr. Disraeli. I feel no doubt that he sincerely intends to carry his proposal about the University if he can. But his hope of carrying it is by satisfying the Irish bishops. Mr. Chichester Fortescue last night declared that, if the Catholics in Ireland accepted the plan, he would not hinder it. I think I can say that will be Mr. Gladstone's line. If, therefore, your Eminence and the other bishops could examine and pronounce upon the plan, this would decide the question—the House permitting. I will, within a few days, get all the information I can upon the points your Eminence mentions, and I hope that the constitutional parts of the plan can be modified. I have heard the two last nights of the debate, and I feel assured that the Liberal Party will never offer anything so advantageous. Let me say that if in politics I am anything, I am a Radical. All my friends are among the Liberals. All my life I have been opposed to the Tory School. I say this because I fancy the Archbishop of Cashel may suppose me a party-politician.

May 25th, 1868.—I believe Mr. Disraeli would have an Irish policy if he could ; but his followers have made it impossible, as they always have and always will. My belief is that there will be neither resignation nor

Letters of Manning,

dissolution, unless some breakdown in the Cabinet comes, which might happen any day.

December 8th, 1872.—The Government are keeping their counsel so well that I have no knowledge of their intentions as to the Irish higher education. The only point is, I think, certain, namely, that both sides of the House will unite in refusing direct endowment to our colleges. To ask for endowment was, five years ago, hopeless and dangerous. To ask for it now would be still more so. I remember that your Eminence would have accepted a Charter without endowment. And I hope that the next scheme proposed may not be lost by demanding endowment.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

February 14th, 1873.—I thought your statement last night complete and as unassailable as it could be. What my transmarine brethren may think of your plan I do not know, but hope to hear. For myself, I would accept it for England. I say this under this reserve, so far as I can judge of so complex a plan on one hearing. I thought your steering first-rate, and your tone towards Ireland and the Irish not only generous but statesmanlike. The plan seems to me to rest on a base so broad and equal that I do not know how the Opposition, or your own doctrinaires, can attack it without adopting the German tyranny.

MR. GLADSTONE TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

February 15th, 1873.—I really do not know whether I am most gratified by your kindness in communicating to me, at once and directly, your impressions about our Irish University plan, or by the spirit of equity and moderation in which they have been formed. I will make them known to my colleagues. On what I described as the negative side of the measure, namely, the removal of grievances and the guarantees for conscience, we have endeavoured to make it absolute and complete. And for this purpose we have even consented to limit the range

Cullen, and Gladstone

of purely academic teaching. Our great object has been to disarm fears and apprehensions, and we feel that if once a spirit of confidence and co-operation is generated, many things may become practicable which would, if prematurely proposed, become impossible.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

February 15th, 1873 (Confidential).—I wrote yesterday both to Cardinal Cullen and to the Rector of the Catholic University, urging them to accept the Bill. I am fully prepared for objections, and am aware not only that I am more easily satisfied than they are, but am more easily satisfied than, perhaps, I should be if I were in Ireland. I saw Mr. Disraeli and Sir Stafford Northcote exchanging signals at the exclusion of Mental Philosophy and Modern History. This they will attack, but it is easy of defence. If you will read the pages I have marked in the pamphlet I send you will see what Mental Philosophy can be made to mean. Any man who attacks you in this will seem to me to be wanting in common sense or sincerity.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

February 14th, 1873.—Last night I heard Mr. Gladstone's statement. Your Eminence will see two things: That grants of public money to Catholic colleges were treated as *ex concessio* impossible; that Trinity College retains its income by ceasing to be denominational, and by becoming open to all. The only side of the question I can judge of is the English and political side, and on this I would venture to say that I think it would be our best prudence to make as much noise as will lead our enemies to believe that we do not like it, but to hold fast by the plan. My reasons are: That it is certain we shall never get anything better; that it is certain we may and, I think, should get something worse. Government has fixed the maximum of concession and consideration towards us, the best of them being judges. Their

Letters of Manning,

supporters will, perhaps, refuse even this. The Opposition will never rise to this maximum. And if we were to provoke any opposition in Government, I greatly fear the advantage we should give to the Opposition. All these are political reasons; but I am here in sight of the storm signals.

CARDINAL CULLEN TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

February 25th, 1873.—I cannot see how we can in any way co-operate in carrying out the proposed measure, or remain silent whilst others undertake to promote. In the first place, mixed education, or education without religion, is directly sanctioned by the establishment of a Queen's College in Dublin, to be called Trinity College. This institution will have the immense buildings of the present Trinity College, with its libraries and museums, all of which, or nearly all, are public property, and, besides, £50,000 per annum. Secondly, the new University will be a mixed teaching body endowed with immense revenues, which will serve to attract Catholic students. Mr. Gladstone, in his speech, says that any of the present professors of Trinity College, who cannot be provided for in the new mixed college, may be appointed to chairs in the new university. In this way an ascendancy for Protestant teaching will be secured for the future. Moreover, it is reported that Mr. Gladstone intends giving professorships to distinguished Germans and Frenchmen who will bring Hegelism and infidelity with them, as Mr. Vesicour, a nephew of Guizot, did to the Cork College.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

February 26th, 1873.—Judging from the papers here, if it were thought that the Catholic bishops were not opposed to the Bill, an anti-Catholic noise would be got up. I cannot but repeat that I think it most expedient to raise a loud opposition on the endowment injustice. I write this with submission, and more as a politician or a watch at the mast-head than anything else.

Cullen, and Gladstone

CARDINAL CULLEN TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

February 27th, 1873.—I write one line to say that our bishops met to-day and will meet again to-morrow. All are sadly disappointed with Mr. Gladstone's Bill, and speak against it much more strongly than I did in my letters to your Grace. The Bishop of Limerick was the only one who attempted to defend the Bill. In the end we agreed to send a petition to Parliament against everything in the Bill that sanctions mixed education.

MR. GLADSTONE TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

March 1st, 1873.—I think it right to point out that the paragraph in the Resolutions, which repudiates on behalf of the R.C. College introduction into the University of Dublin, however intended, is really war to the knife, and that a petition against the Bill would have been far less mischievous. How is it possible that this should not have been perceived?

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

March 1st, 1873.—Once more I fall back on what I said yesterday. Why not make two centres and two groups under one Chancellor? The circumstances of Ireland demand a treatment not less favourable than we receive in England. We refuse Oxford and Cambridge as mixed and godless. We accept the London University because we have no contact with it but for examination. Why not give a Charter to our University without any endowment except as under your Bill, by competition? I believe this last to be the best course, short of Mr. Pitt's policy. The Opposition cannot refuse it. The bishops, I am sure, would be greatly reassured by it.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO CARDINAL CULLEN

March 1st, 1873.—Last night the Opposition believed that the Irish members would vote against the Bill, and that, with them, they might defeat the Government.

Letters of Manning,

Immediately they shut up, and would not talk of endowment. They could not give it if they would, and they would not if they could. I will believe them when they will try a division on it, not before. Would it not be possible to demand an examining university distinct from Dublin, so making two centres in two distinct places in Ireland? The tyrannous Liberalism of this country can be cured by nothing short of a public disaster, which may God avert.

CARDINAL CULLEN TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

March 2nd, 1873.—I told my mind most fully. He* assured me that great care would be taken in appointing the new professors and that Catholics would be perfectly safe. I replied that we got similar assurances regarding the Queen's Colleges, and that the first appointment was that of an infidel to the chair of History in Cork, and the last was that of an immoral poet, a Mr. Armstrong, to the class of English literature. I had this poet's work in my pocket and I showed to His Excellency a wicked poem against the Confessional, in which the poet concludes with this prayer: "Now may the good Christ rid us of all priests!" Lord Spencer admitted that he had made this appointment himself, but said he had not seen the book of poems! His Excellency, in the end, said he could not make any promise in regard to amending the Bill, adding that he hoped we would not embarrass the Government too much. I replied that we should provide for the salvation of the souls committed to our care.

MR. GLADSTONE TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

March 3rd, 1873.—I do not see my way to acting upon your suggestion, if I understand right, nor have I the means of knowing whether it would produce a soothing effect; but there is much that may come up out of the present confusion, as the public and the classes grope their way through chaos to firm land. What I understand

* Lord Spencer, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

Cullen, and Gladstone

from you and from your brethren in Ireland is this: that two great items, which it might have been hoped would have been boons, are grievances, viz., the provision of a teaching body and the introduction of the R.C. college as such into the university.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

March 3rd, 1873.—I still say the Irish bishops have not rejected the Bill. Out of this shake to all parties may come a policy higher, bolder, broader and proportionate to your Church Act. *Sursum Corda*. Look higher and try what this country will admit to be justice to Ireland.

March 7th, 1873.—Lord Lyttelton told me to-day, at the Athenæum, that you are well and in good courage. Worse things might befall you than Housman's bitter levity. You will not, I hope, take to heart the opposition of the bishops in Ireland. Non-endowment, mixed education, and godless colleges are three bitter things to them. Treat it as an earthquake.

MR. GLADSTONE TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

March 8th, 1873.—This is a blow to the Bill, but it could be borne. Your (my) demands are easily dealt with. I should be ashamed to offer a measure that did not concede them. I shall fight to the last against all comers, but much against my inclination, which is marvellously attracted to the vision of my liberty dawning like a sunrise from beyond the hills. For when this offer has been made, my contract with the country is fulfilled, and I am free to take my course.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

March 12th, 1873.—I cannot conceal from myself that there may be a providence of God in this check. This is not your fault, nor the Bill's fault, but the fault of England and Scotland and of three anti-Catholic centuries. As towards us, you went as far as you well could. The division of last night may give you back a liberty which the Nonconformists have heavily oppressed.

Letters of Manning,

MR. GLADSTONE TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING

March 13th, 1873 (Private).—You give no heed to the wailings and pleas of my old age ; but I do, and the future in politics hardly exists for me, unless some new phase arise, in which (as in 1868) a special call may appear. To such call, please God, I will answer if there be breath in my body. Your Irish brethren have received in the late vote of Parliament the most extravagant compliment ever paid them. They have destroyed the measure, which otherwise was safe enough.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING TO MR. GLADSTONE

March 18th, 1873.—I did not look for any other result, and I have no pity on wailings and pleas of old age. But I wish your party were dissolved and reconstituted. I remember your telling me that your majority was too great. The last election drew to you men who have no right to you. The Disestablishment drew about you the sons of Eldad and Medad, and I wish you were far from their embrace. My belief is that you will yet settle the Irish University question. After that, if you wish to go up Mt. Tabor I may be more willing to listen.

November 25th, 1873.—I am glad you have no Catholic in your Government. You will be stronger to save the country from conflagration, which a mountebank might kindle by sending Tadpole and Taper with a cry, "Faith or Freedom," that is religious persecution and Imperial despotism. Is this hypocrisy never to end ?

February 5th, 1874.—Let me give you the appreciation of *Idiotes* on this election. It is the inevitable result of your whole policy. The country made a heroic act to disestablish the Irish Church, and having done it has been frightened at its own heroism, and is afraid of being asked to do anything great again, at least for a time. It is sitting down to take its breath. It sees, also, the logic of the Liberation Society, and is resolved not to continue the conversation. Next, it is frightened back by the Education Act of 1870. This has roused the Church of

Cullen, and Gladstone

England and divided our vote. Thirdly, the country was afraid of the Nonconformist Radicals. Fourthly, Lowe has given a repulsive character to the Government. And Bright's return has renewed and increased the fear that the extreme faction would force their policy on the Cabinet. No doubt you suffer because you lead. Nobody can go first without receiving more stones than anybody else. I feel too, *stultus ego*, that you have exhausted the mission you undertook. Say what you like, you will have another. I do not confide in the ethical character of the Nonconformists. I have worked a good deal with them in the Permissive Bill affairs. They have each one swallowed a Pope, and I have no chance with legions of Infallibilists. And I like still less the Philosophical Radicals, Liberals, and Oriental despots of the *Pall Mall* type, and still less the strong-minded women. Only do not be sharpened or soured or saddened. There are three words for you. If I go on, you will burn me.

So the great men of other days had their Irish hopes and troubles, disasters and disappointments. And after they had died the death of the just, others came and reaped where they had sown—for the Irish harvest is always late, but not later than Doomsday.

SHANE LESLIE.

WM. SAMUEL LILLY

WILLIAM SAMUEL LILLY, a name long familiar in the world of letters as that of an accomplished student, writer, and defender of the Catholic Faith, was the eldest son of a Devonshire gentleman, Mr. William Lilly, of Windout House, near Exeter, and was born on July 10th, 1840. He lived into his eightieth year, dying after much suffering, but rather unexpectedly, on August 29th, 1919, at his residence in West Kensington. Like the observant Ulysses he had travelled in his time, beheld men and cities, made acquaintance with East and West. He read books in many languages and remembered what was in them. He reflected on the wise words of his teachers, marked the unwisdom of the multitude, took his choice of principles in early manhood, and while in the prime of life and with complete intellectual assent submitted to the Roman Church.

His career falls into two very distinct stages, which we may divide at the year 1870, when the success he had attained as a District Judge in India was checked and finally thwarted by bereavement with its consequent impaired health, and when he turned his thoughts to a second beginning in England, to the Catholic creed, and to literature as a profession. His first wife, as I have just intimated, a woman of rare mental power, died in their home on the banks of the Nerbudda, far from her native land. His second wife, whom so many will call to mind with deep affection, for she had an extraordinary charm of manner, a beautiful simplicity, and the secret of winning hearts, preceded Mr. Lilly into the Church. I do not know the precise date or place of his reception. It happened before 1873, in which year he became secretary of the Catholic Union of Great Britain—a post the duties of which he fulfilled until the end. He might have said truly that he was by calling a teacher, endowed with gifts as well as favoured by circumstances that laid necessity on him to write, to speak, to argue, to press forward into the hottest front of battle on behalf of truth, denied and

William Samuel Lilly

assailed, scorned and out of fashion, in a century the most irreligious, according to Von Hartmann, which Europe has known. Mr. Lilly joined himself, therefore, to the group of Catholic laymen, of whom De Maistre, Manzoni, Ozanam, were leaders some hundred years ago, and Dr. W. G. Ward, Lord Acton, C. S. Devas, Wilfrid Ward, may be quoted as doing honour to it in the last seventy among Englishmen. He won his own distinguished rank therein, which will not be taken from him.

For the task in hand his qualifications were admirably adapted from first to last. When we unfold the course of studies he pursued we tell how he spent his days. With Mark Pattison's father he might have quoted that sentence in the Eton *Latin Grammar*, "*Concessi Cantabrigiam ad capiendum ingenii cultum.*" At an early age he went to Cambridge in order to cultivate his mind, a proverb no less true of him at seventy-nine than when he was only nineteen. The College chosen was Peterhouse, reckoned the most ancient of the University. His tutor, Adolphus William Ward, afterwards Principal of Owens College, now Master of Peterhouse and knighted, has won renown in many fields, but especially in the department of literary criticism, dramatic, poetical, historical. He enjoyed the reputation of being a profound German scholar, when German scholars were few at Cambridge; W. S. Lilly was among his favourite pupils; and he sent him to the perusal of Teutonic genius, of which the evidence meets our eyes in citations abounding on every page from a never-wearied pen. It is, however, a curious fact within my knowledge that when Mr. Lilly came back after his sojourn in India he had almost forgotten German. Six months of renewed attention to it gave him a mastery over its uninviting periods in subjects widely remote, from the abstruse terminology of Kant to the social economics of Roscher.

Yet I am not implying that Mr. Lilly's mind was formed on a German pattern. The priceless gift he perfected at Cambridge and never lost was a training in the classical languages of antiquity. He might philosophize

William Samuel Lilly

(a little too much) in Kantian mood and figure; but his doctor of divinity was Plato, his professor of politics, Aristotle; and he turned to "the lofty grave tragedians" of the Attic stage for refreshment with a zest to which his correspondence bore witness until it ceased altogether. The authors he preferred were Sophocles in Greek and Horace in Latin; though by temperament and conviction a mystic, he found less charm in the oracular verses of Æschylus. Speaking broadly, there was no considerable work of the great classic writers which he had passed by unread. Horace he knew by heart, as he knew Pope, who resembled as well as imitated the Augustan satirist; the words of these two delightful singers dwelt frequently on his lips; the touch of Epicurean sentiment, although never his considered view of things, did not displease him. It lent an air of holiday to the brooding spirit, weighed down by thought, and a refined grace to companionship with him.

In 1859 W. S. Lilly was elected a scholar of Peterhouse, where he studied law, taking the degree of LL.M. as late as 1870. But in 1861 he passed into the Indian Civil Service, and in due course went out to India. He became acquainted with Tamil, Telugu, and Canarese, the Dravidian languages spoken in the Presidency of Madras, which have not, I am told, an original literature, but derive their topics and the treatment of them from Sanscrit sources. Stationed in native districts, and accompanied by his wife, Mr. Lilly gained notice from the heads of Government as a capable administrator. He could be severe when the state of things demanded it; and his appointment as Under-Secretary at Madras gave him an advance towards the highest positions never destined to be followed up. In 1869 his Indian prospects were terminated by the sad event of Mrs. Lilly's death and the failure of his own health, as already mentioned. But in serving an apprenticeship to rule over Easterns the young English student, alone in a great solitude, had fallen under their spell. He was moved by the sympathy of a Mohammedan friend who taught him resignation to God's will when stricken down beneath his great sorrow. Far from

William Samuel Lilly

the Western crowds and systems, he learned what silence means, how marvellous are the fruits of retirement and tranquillity, how vain is the illusion of Maya, "the painted veil which men call life." The imperial arrogance of Islam spoke to some answering chord in his British breast ; he admired its manliness and vigour, its manifest right to control the feeble Hindus, were the English to quit their shores. Yet again, as we know by other instances, while turning with dislike from the infinite and often repulsive idolatries of these latter millions, he could not fail to be drawn strongly towards the vision of Buddhism and its founder, whose ethical spirit seemed to be triumphant in all possible worlds—at least, such was the mild contention of its monks and their sacred Scriptures. Between the Briton in the East and the Buddhist teaching there would appear to be some natural affinity, despite the fact that he is not a contemplative or given to sitting still.

At all events, it is impossible to read Mr. Lilly's volumes without calling to mind the saying reported by Diogenes Laertius of the Macedonian world-conqueror, "If I were not Alexander I would be Diogenes." Had my friend not been a Christian convinced and unremoved, he would surely have turned for comfort to the "Four Noble Truths" of Gautama. Some drops from the enchanting cup of Nirvana had been sprinkled on his brow. I wrote of Amiel in this REVIEW many years ago, "That passion for the One, everlasting and unchangeable, which always returns when science has carried men dispersedly into all provinces of research, and when division of labour means confusion of thought, had taken overmastering hold of him." The attraction for Mr. Lilly of what I may term the spirit of Buddhism did not lie precisely there ; it was ethical rather than ontological ; but real and constant, so far as a genuine submission to the Church's teaching would allow. It gave him a point of view from which he was enabled to judge modern civilization like a pilgrim out of some distant planet. Amiel could "think himself down" to any degree of the impersonal, the unconscious, the subconscious, or so he imagined. We shall not come

William Samuel Lilly

upon disquieting claims like these in the balanced periods of our Catholic writer, often as he gazed into the mysteries of our being. What we have to set on record is the general effect of Mr. Lilly's residence and meditations in Indian solitudes on his manner of dealing with problems in theology, and with arguments in controversy. He keeps ever before him a spiritual "Mercator's projection," as it were, of the religions of the world. He cannot forget the teeming myriads in Farther Asia, neither Christian nor anti-Christian, but disciples of Mohammed, Gautama, Confucius, Laotze, or moulded by the immemorial laws of caste in countless grades of a ritual which encompasses life and death inexorably. I do not know of any other among apologists to whom this thought is so unceasingly present, or on whose pages it flings so deep a shadow. In Mr. Lilly's philosophy a religion which consents to be less than a world-religion is none at all.

And so, farewell to the Anglican Church, the "accident of an accident," the birth of a local compromise in the Sixteenth Century, which carries its Island wherever it goes. Emphatically a sect, national to its finest fibre, how would it survive when thrown into the devouring furnace of religions to which æons of time and hundreds of millions of believers are habitual ideas? If there is anything supernatural in Christianity it must bear these characters upon it. When Mr. Lilly, returning to Europe, looked round, his eyes were opened to the Papal Church; he saw Rome, certainly not less majestic than Benares or Mecca, the head and front of Christian history, with a background of dogmas, institutions, sanctities, miracles, and a proved exercise of redeeming power, not to be denied or put by. As a world-religion it challenged comparison with every other; as a philosophic system it stood above them all. Every Asiatic traveller would acknowledge its immensity, its mystery, its holiness; and its claim to a heavenly origin was the claim of Christianity brought down to the latest hour. Such motives of belief, with prayer and example close at hand, might well convince a sincere lover of truth, whose life had been shaken to its centre, and

William Samuel Lilly

who was beginning it a second time. This well-known language of the "rebirth" unto a higher state would not have been foreign to a reader of Oriental lore. In one shape or another the passage of Mr. Lilly from his inherited English communion to the Universal Church must have been as I venture to describe it—the homage of the religious East to a yet more spiritual revelation, in which Reason found peace, and tranquillity was divine energy flowing forth upon the heart of man in silent streams.

We shall never look far into Mr. Lilly's tractates on his special themes without discovering the mystic in the logician. He sought whether in men or books the spirit which, not content with Bacon's "dry light" of reason, brought all its faculties to the acquisition of the Highest Good; which recognized in the "heart," as Holy Scripture speaks, a power, and in its experiences a disclosure from the Unseen, whereby reality is best attained. Naturally, then, he felt a kinship with Pascal, with Vinet, and above all with Newman. He had not long been a Catholic before he presented himself at Edgbaston, and so began the friendship, rich in consequences, illustrated by deeds as well as words of lasting import, that honoured master and disciple alike. To Mr. Lilly the interpreter of Catholic principles to be named first and followed at all times was the recluse of the Oratory, "biding so still at home." His selections from the forty volumes of Newman's publications, in particular from the date of conversion, went into several editions. As secretary of the Catholic Union he speedily gained the confidence of its President, the Duke of Norfolk, who respected his judgment and usually followed it. We are all aware that when Leo XIII opened his memorable reign, he was determined to raise Dr. Newman to the Sacred College. In the action, however, of the Duke of Norfolk on that great occasion, Mr. Lilly's discreet and seasonable share cannot be doubted, although he has, perhaps, left no record of the particular steps taken. A reference to them will be found in his *Essays and Speeches*, where he has reprinted

William Samuel Lilly

his tribute to Cardinal Newman, when the end of that illustrious career came on August 11th, 1890. Another service he did when Sir J. Fitzjames Stephen made "the great mistake" of declaring in print that the Cardinal "has confined his defence of his own creed to the proposition that it is the only possible alternative to atheism." At once, and with success, Mr. Lilly destroyed the force of this attack by a letter to the *St. James's Gazette*, which the Cardinal adopted in the next edition of the *Grammar of Assent*. I pass quickly over the various addresses and other measures by which the Catholic Union supported Cardinal Newman's dignity, and did themselves honour in so doing. To each and all Mr. Lilly gave his devoted attention. And not only during the seventeen years of their friendship, but repeatedly after the Cardinal had left these "shadows and semblances," his memory was recalled, his telling arguments were quoted in Mr. Lilly's ever fresh pages, before the large and growing public which he had won to himself in England, America, and the British Empire. All his literary efforts, it is not too much to say, were dedicated to Newman's memory, and by his teaching ruled. They deal often with subjects which had come into prominence only subsequently to the master's chief creative periods; but the endeavour was to take such views as he would have approved, by applying his method to the matters in dispute.

From the year 1875 until a few days before he died, Mr. Lilly was occupied in this vast undertaking of Catholic Defence; and he has left behind him a volume which I am seeing through the press, entitled *An Invisible Kingdom*. That name would furnish a happy description of his doctrine taken as a whole; it contains a statement of fact, an appeal to faith, and a ground of belief. In his powerful discussion of first principles, *The Great Enigma*, we light upon a passage from the treatise "*De Deo*," which my revered master, Cardinal Franzelin, composed for his auditors at the Roman College—a passage of axiomatic significance in our schools. It runs thus: "The whole metaphysical order is constituted by the

William Samuel Lilly

necessary laws of essences ; which laws are necessary because the Divine Essence postulates them. Hence the Divine Essence is by its own necessary perfection, and not by free will, the source and measure of the whole truth of metaphysics." Readers of Plato will declare without hesitation that in these words they hear an echo of Platonism fully rendered. They will be stating the fact ; but such Platonism comes down to us from the New Testament, the Greek Fathers, St. Augustine, and St. Thomas Aquinas. The world of Pure Reason, all these affirm, is founded on God's necessary thought, which is identical with Himself. Laws of numbers, of motion, of life, of ethics, derive their origin and value from the Infinite Mind. Our supreme Catholic poet has given to the " Ideas," in which Greek philosophy and Christian dogma conspire to set forth the final explanation of things, a glory of translucent verse, never likely to lose its radiance. And among Platonists of the Dantean wing I would reckon Mr. Lilly, subjoining as a caution that, however well-read in the works of Hellenic and modern metaphysicians, he had not been trained to the study of St. Thomas or in the scholastic tradition.

From motives partly of apologetics and in a high degree personal he was led to the defence of *a priori* truth as it is elaborated by Kant rather than by the Angelic Doctor. The effect is not always more satisfactory in his rehearsal than we feel it to be in those Sibylline books, the *Critiques*, which have transformed but surely darkened in the process, our world of Western thought. I shall speak to this point again. My drift now carries me simply to lay down, as the general impression made on me by Mr. Lilly's volumes, whatever their subject, that he saw the life of man, the course of all possible creations, in this way and no other, "*sub specie æternitatis*." Had he not done so, much of his work, entertaining, brilliant, learned as it was, would, in the absence of the light behind, resemble so much first-rate journalism, written for the hour. But even where it might seem of a passing or only occasional value, it never fails to keep the Platonic seal, to recall

William Samuel Lilly

men's minds to that "*Fiat Lux*" which has kindled in us the spark of divine wisdom. I owe some apology, mayhap, for beginning my brief account of his contributions to literature with a preface from the Schools. Yet I owe still more to my deceased friend the duty of showing how profoundly metaphysical his beliefs were, and how they set him apart, once for all, from "the mob of gentlemen who write with ease" in a scribbling age.

He wrote with ease, indeed, although not without preparation, often lasting over months or years. His continual reading, tenacious memory, and intercourse with an exceedingly various society of men and women, yielded as their outcome materials from almost every side, except physical science, and a style which held the middle tone between essay and history. Attention has been rightly called to its French qualities, the lively movement and social air, the lucid order and effective summing up of parts. In language Mr. Lilly, while using a wealth of quotation which disguises now and then his proper share of authorship, was more Latinized than idiomatic, sometimes to excess; for he wrote as he thought, and much of his meditation went on over the classical or French volumes he had constantly in hand. He was a student of Voltaire's prose works; not a great deal, I fancy, of his correspondence; and he caught from the universal mocker an occasional tinge of sarcasm or gaiety; but Voltaire's day is long ended. At the same time, editors of magazines know that good sword-play fascinates the public; and if our apologist had the skill to harness the philosopher of Ferney to his chariot wheels, it would be a Christian revenge. Mr. Lilly chose deliberately the path of journalism, where he might win the largest circulation for his views, an immediate hearing, and the fame which nowadays follows advertisement. I daresay no man, except Carlyle, has written harder things in condemnation of bad journalism than we come upon in the treatise which is called *On Right and Wrong*. Its author concludes a fierce indictment to this effect: "The newspaper press during the last quarter of a century"—that

William Samuel Lilly

is to say, between 1870 and 1890—"has done more than anything else to *de-ethicize* public life ; to lay the axe to the root of duty, self-devotion, self-sacrifice, the elements of the moral greatness of a nation." He considers its main achievements to be the triumph of mendacity, the corruption of the intellect. Nevertheless (or should we not rather exclaim, therefore?) he went down into the arena, prepared like St. Paul at Ephesus, to "fight with beasts." He could not defend the Faith unless he attacked falsehood in its most formidable champions, the public looking on, and compelled to applaud whenever he brought his adversary to the ground.

We distinguish in his voluminous writings, which extend over forty-four years, a diversity of handling, as they happen to be addressed by Mr. Lilly to his fellow-Catholics or to the "man in the street," otherwise the "man of the world," who was utterly ignorant of our genuine teaching and indifferent to religion in any shape. Among his own people, in this REVIEW and our leading newspaper, his arguments were naturally drawn from all the Catholic premisses. But so to reason with unbelievers would be labour lost. Where authority is denied it ceases to have effect. We should bear in mind always, while reading an apologist, that he is under the necessity of discovering a common ground on which his opponent is willing to join issue. In this situation, every proposition he advances must become an *argumentum ad hominem*. To persuade Catholics only eloquence was needed ; the premisses were allowed on both sides. Not so when the world lay remote from the Church, permeated with sceptic doubts and the alleged certitudes of materialism ; in days when Darwin, Spencer and Huxley formed a triumvirate which tyrannized over public opinion. Huxley, for example, shut out St. George Mivart, the Catholic F.R.S., from the Athenæum Club, on no other ground than his criticism of the Darwinian hypotheses. Samuel Butler, a critic of another school, relates his own story of excommunication by the Press and, consequently, by the public, for having dared to cross-examine Charles Darwin's views

William Samuel Lilly

from a hostile platform. The twenty years noted by Mr. Lilly for "corruption of the intellect" deserved that stigma. I cannot say whether Mr. Mallock's *New Republic* still circulates among readers; but, as a picture of the agnostic era, which was then coming in, and as a prophecy of its Dead Sea fruits, that remarkable satire and parody should be held in remembrance. Mr. Mallock also wrote a yet greater book, *Is Life Worth Living?* when he and Mr. Lilly were seeing much of one another. Scepticism, materialism, pessimism, and at last indifference to life itself, such were the aspects of a growing anarchy, which few Catholics had the art or means of discerning, but which stirred Mr. Lilly's zeal and determined his mode of approach to the anti-Christian forces.

Accordingly, in *Chapters of European History*, which affords a sketch of the Church's vicissitudes from Apostolic days to our own and was written for edification as its main object, the manner is not polemical so much as sympathetic; an atmosphere of devout fervour rests on its pages. I ought to have warned my reader that all the volumes I touch upon here came out parcel-wise, in the form of separate articles, which was the preliminary stage to their appearance as books when their contents had done duty in magazines. One agreeable consequence I remember was that the celebrated Russian Ober-procuror, M. Pobiedonostsev, feeling the power and charm of Mr. Lilly's paper on "The Christian Revolution," which dealt mainly with St. Augustine, himself translated it into his own language and spread copies of it far and wide. I was staying under my friend's always hospitable roof, when the great man's letter and translation arrived from the Russian Embassy. By and by Mr. Lilly compressed his two volumes into one, calling it now *Christianity and Modern Civilization*. It includes an effective account of Pope Gregory VII, and a chapter probably unique on the legal procedure of the Inquisition. But the new and revised edition does not please me so well as the original, which was bathed, so to speak, in the first golden splendours of a Catholic neophyte.

William Samuel Lilly

Much the same has been my feeling in regard to the early and subsequent redactions of what *The Times* refers to as the "once famous" *Ancient Religion and Modern Thought*, which came out in 1884. From force of association I am tempted to say, "The old is better." As time went on Mr. Lilly gained a firmness of touch and a sense of his own intellectual whereabouts (if I may use that ugly Shakespearean word) which entitled him to the master's dignity; but the comparative tenderness of younger days made way for something sterner, and the joy of battle, especially when party politics ruled the fray, became slightly truculent. There was a certain excuse for it. The denial of any First Principles having an eternal value converted leaders of opinion like H. Spencer to destroyers of mankind. Huxley gloried in sharpening his claws and beak against all who would not agree with him—and yet he had nothing better to teach than that "laws of conduct" emerged from "laws of comfort." Mr. John Morley, as he then was, took pride in his anti-theism, gave Rousseau's fatal philosophy a seductive English setting, and made an idol of Robespierre. The late Cotter Morison substituted an ignominious *Service of Man* for the service of God. The most captivating in style of English historians, J. A. Froude, indulged his fancy for anti-Catholic romance, and caricatured by extraordinary lack of scholarship the true Erasmus. But what of W. E. Gladstone? My friend judged him to be of the tribe of political sophists, for ever transfixed by the lightning strokes of Aristophanes, who betrayed Demos to ruin by their sycophancy, their love of power at any price, their watching "how the wind veered." Now a Catholic and a philosopher of the central school has certainly his own right to charge upon Jean-Jacques Rousseau the worst calamities of the French Revolution, and on his followers the evils of modern democracy. Mr. Lilly did so much, with vigorous denunciation of those who were putting numbers instead of values, to the peril of civilized order, and preparing its downfall. Was this a crime?

William Samuel Lilly

In choosing for attack the giants, or mighty men of renown, whose dominion over minds will seem in a better time portentous, the Catholic David gave proof of a bold spirit, while running on the very edge of hazard. How did he come off? We may reply that the mere fact of assault gave earnest of victory. The truth, to borrow from Tertullian, asks one thing only, not to be condemned unknown. It would be impossible to exaggerate the ignorance of adepts in physical science or of cultivated men of letters generally, with regard to our faith and our philosophy during the period in question. Our difficulty was not to show the flaws in Spencerian or Darwinian systems, but to get a hearing before the modern court of appeal. An Index, banning Catholic writers, was in full force, admitting rare exceptions. Mr. Lilly, in taking the offensive, broke a way for himself by which others could pass. He did not lay claim to special scientific knowledge; he argued in the plainest terms which the subject would endure, but as a metaphysician. His affirmative rule was that which Cardinal Franzelin expressed in the sentences quoted above. His negative or polemical rule was to demonstrate the perfect inadequacy, the inherent contradiction, of the system he was engaged in pulling down. As now the Darwinian hypothesis which halted between the struggle for existence and Lamarck's organic appetencies no longer reigns; as the heroic self-sacrifice displayed in the war makes the "laws of comfort" sound like a sacrilege in presence of death; and as the huge fabric of Spencer's "synthetic philosophy" lies in ruins; we may at least declare that the cause to which my friend dedicated his life has so far won. "*Victrix causa Diis placuit.*" I will go a step farther and record my persuasion that his writings contributed, quietly but successfully, to the change in many minds, long secret but making itself gradually perceptible and at length asserting its power, from agnostic pride and the insolence of materialism to the present mood of inquiry or aspiration after some ideal world. In particular, I would maintain that the criticism of Spencer which travels through Mr.

William Samuel Lilly

Lilly's books *On Right and Wrong*, *The Great Enigma*, and *Many Mansions*, leaves not a stone standing upon a stone of his pseudo-metaphysics. It is profound, and it is complete. Again, my confidence grows, after many perusals, in the destructive energy of reasoning applied to Huxley's mechanical system with its sham front of idealism; although Mr. Lilly's opening move was not the best, or was liable even to the counter-move, "Nego." But, as the *Spectator* observed, questions had been forced upon the doughty agnostic which he would find no small difficulty in answering. And he never did answer them. He let judgment go by default.

But Mr. Lilly's "environment" was larger than Britain. He reported on the towering creations of Spinoza, Schopenhauer, Kant; on religions, their founders, and their scriptures, such as the Buddha, Mohammed, the "Saints of Islam," the Sacred Books of the East. His volume, *Many Mansions*, for which I suggested the title and the motto from Aratus, holds the centre of all he composed; it is, perhaps, the best thing he did. In treatment we must own its candour, its freedom from the desire to snatch a rhetorical victory, and its acquaintance with abstruse far-away subjects. On Schopenhauer it is deservedly severe. The weaker points of a most opportune book are due to the strategical method which seems to allow the absolute validity of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*—an untenable idea—and to the absence of a positive refutation of the Buddhist fallacies. Its merit, and that is great, consists in the widening of horizons, the contact effected between Catholic Christianity and the religions of Asia, which is necessary if we mean to extend our conquests beyond the Western world. For manifestly "precept must be upon precept, line upon line," thus bringing out clear, by the comparative and critical method, the sovereign excellence of the Gospel, unless we are to sit down vanquished before a religious stalemate. Elements of the right solution are scattered through Mr. Lilly's works; and until we continue the labours of Bishop Bigandet, the Abbé Dubois,

William Samuel Lilly

M. de Harlez, and others more close to our time, a volume such as *Many Mansions* will serve as a promising entrance to these "worlds unrealized."

All characters in our human tragedy seem as if they were drawing together—it might be for the Fifth Act—being called up on the same stage by science, research, exploration, conquest, and commerce. He that would be chorus-leader to the play must have a versatile art and adamant convictions. By temperament Mr. Lilly added point to the saying, "*Quidquid vult valde vult*"; his resolution bordered on obstinacy, sometimes, indeed, was thought so. During our long intercourse of thirty-seven years, I never knew him to give up a principle or change his theory of life and conduct. To the family motto, "*Per ardua stabilis*," he stood ever faithful. He was no bigot, since he could render a reason for the faith that was in him; but by training, by disposition, and by circumstance, he took views which politeness termed conservative, but to the average man they appeared reactionary, out of date, and only not dangerous to modern civilization because few really held them. Mr. Lilly retorted by denouncing the "Shibboleths" of that average person, about whom he agreed with Carlyle—a master grim and great whose violent outbursts of scorn he enjoyed a little too heartily—and by laying his book, *A Century of Revolution*, in 1889, on the monument of the "Tiers-Etat" as a coping-stone. He fought, but with argument not mere invective, against the "false democracy" which Burke showed to be injustice and Stuart Mill serfdom. With Carlyle he believed that England, if not all Europe outside the German Empire, was "rushing down to anarchy and government by the basest." He never entered a polling-booth; he delighted to satirize the House of Commons. In a volume designated *The New France*, of which *The Times* in its obituary speaks with a kind of Liberal horror, he told many unpalatable truths concerning the Third Republic, a form of ostensibly elective rule which is "gerrymandered" by professional politicians, and which legislates against God and His Christ. Our English

William Samuel Lilly

partisans of "progress to the bottomless pit" do not welcome those who tell them whither they are hastening. But of their latter-day achievements, "*si quæris monumenta, circumspice.*" The writer who can cite for the laws of human society Burke, for the fruits of sham democracy Mill, and for the Divine Rights of religion under any régime the Catholic Church, need not be afraid of speaking with his enemies in the gate.

France, its people, history, and literature, always occupied, and alternately charmed and irritated, Mr. Lilly's imagination. It might have been his native soil; perhaps I have heard of ancient ties which his kinsfolk claimed with a nation he loved—it is not too much to say—passionately. The lady to whom he was united after his second wife's decease, and who tended him with unremitting care during his frequent illnesses of latter years, is by origin of Geneva, French in language and disposition. In their pleasant home that exquisite idiom was constantly heard. Except Alfred de Musset, I am not aware of Mr. Lilly's devotion to any French poets; Molière, of course, he knew well; but the double masterpiece of analysis and interpretation in which he summed up the merits of the *Human Comedy* of Balzac, exalting its creator to the throne of a "French Shakespeare," could have been written only by a man who had travelled long years in the enchanted and too frequently plague-stricken regions of a literature still the most powerful in Europe for good and evil.

On this warning note I will close. Did the occasion allow, it would be an agreeable task to dwell on my friend's social qualities, which brought so many men and women within his large circle of acquaintance, and made his house the meeting-place of distinguished people, differing in creed or party or profession, but sure of entertainment in the best sense when they came together round his delightful board. I could tell of honours bestowed on him; election to the Athenæum Club, degree in Arts from Cambridge University, Lecturer at the Royal Institution, Honorary Fellowship of Peterhouse, and other adornments, none of which he sought. My

William Samuel Lilly

recollections of our journeyings in Devonshire, or in Normandy or to the Austrian Tirol, are mingled with those of illustrious guests like the late Archbishop Ireland, and of the Eucharistic Congress in London, incidents that proved how full of practical wisdom the secretary of the Catholic Union ever was, according to the opportunities given. But now there still remain not a few splendid fronts of so wide and lofty a memorial, built by the energy of one man, never pausing for half a century, which we might contemplate with admiration. In his own array of volumes, not to dwell on the *Characteristics* of Newman and Manning edited by him, W. S. Lilly has bequeathed to Catholic students, as well as to the more thoughtful among the reading public, an inheritance "rich in the spoils of time," sound in the bases of philosophy, edifying as religion, and almost a library in itself. He is a sure guide to the high temples of thought. In submitting to the Cathedra Petri one so variously gifted made a sacrifice of greater possibilities of fame and influence than he could hope to win by turning away from the crowd to the solitude, entering as it were into a cloister of the intellect which worldlings would not visit. The deepest thought of his heart was belief in holiness before God. He revered the Saints, setting them far above any other manifestation of genius, in a sphere apart. Their judgment of life was to him absolute and without appeal. His writings bear testimony to my own personal knowledge of the man, who, living in society much, never lowered his standard or ceased to utter the solemn adjuration, "*Discite justitiam moniti, et ne temnere Divos.*" What he taught he practised. When the dread summons came he bowed to it with cheerful serenity. His years had been filled for a long while with trials of sickness; he had seen many friends pass away, and a world shaken by war still more agitated by the problems of peace. For himself he had fought the battle of life courageously, as a soldier of the Lord of Hosts; and it is my hope and belief that the last cry was "Victory!"

WILLIAM BARRY.

ANON-JUROR'S LETTER:

WITH A CATHOLIC'S COMMENTARY

I HAPPEN to possess twelve MS. notebooks of that sincere and powerful writer, William Law, author of *The Serious Call*, *Christian Perfection*, the *Spirit of Love* and other works. These notebooks contain transcripts from various authors, and some papers by Law himself, completed, but never published. One of these might interest modern readers. It states, lucidly, the position of a High Church Anglican of some two hundred years ago. It is in the form of a letter to a brother clergyman. Law was in Orders, but, because he would not take the oath of allegiance at the accession of George I, he was disqualified for active service, and, in the earlier part of his life he was tutor in the family of Mr. Gibbon, the historian's grandfather. This letter must have been written in that period, while he was still interested in the ecclesiastical question, which, later, after that he had accepted the teaching of the mystical German shoemaker, Jacob Behmen, seemed to him to be of no importance. In 1717 William Law, at about thirty years old, made his admirably vigorous assault upon Hoadley, the Whig and Rationalist Bishop of Bangor, on account of the latter's theory of an invisible Church of all true Christians. Law then asserted a visible, though divided, Catholic and Episcopalian Church. In his later days Law himself thought of the Church, not as a net catching all kinds of fish, or a field where wheat was mixed with weeds, but as an invisible and unembodied unity of all such souls as were really grafted to the true Vine, the spirit of Christ. In 1731, however, Law wrote three letters, published after his death, to "a Lady inclined to enter the Romish Communion," in which his argument is akin to that stated in the following unpublished letter. The MS. letter is not dated, but it must, I think, have been written in the period between 1720 and 1730. The first sentence indicates that Law, like many of the

A Non-Juror's Letter

non-juring clergy, had once had doubts whether he ought not to join the Church of Rome.

The whole argument in this MS. is based upon the assumption that there was, in the days of St. Cyprian and, even later, in those of St. Augustine, "an one Catholic Church as visible as Christianity itself," but that, at some unspecified time, this one undivided visible Church ceased to exist, and that now there are various distinct and separate Churches, all descended from it, and of equal title. Thus an Anglican or Lutheran, who now says "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," speaks in a sense different from that of the men who drew up the Creeds. They had in mind a concrete Catholic Church, visibly united; he has in mind a Catholic Church which is not a visible fact, but an idea. This is the very line of division between Catholics, in our sense, and non-Catholics. In our view there never has been a moment, from the earliest ages to to-day, when there did not exist a single, visible, organically and avowedly united Catholic Church, and when there were not also, to an extent varying at different periods, outside communions, more or less remote, which claimed to be, in some sense, but were not admitted by Catholics to be, branches of the Catholic Church. This Catholic Church, of which the centre, made increasingly manifest in the evolution of history, is the Chair of St. Peter at Rome, is, we believe, identical with the Catholic Church of the Creeds. The Anglican theory of the Church is, so to speak, "in the air," because Anglicans will not accept the concrete fact, just as the neo-Platonist philosophy, according to St. Augustine, was in the air, because the philosophers were too proud to accept the incarnation of the Word in Jesus Christ. Be it observed that a Donatist could have used William Law's argument for resisting the call of Augustine, and remaining in the communion of his fathers and fellow-Africans, a communion undoubtedly based upon episcopal descent from the Apostles, and accused by its Catholic opponents not of doctrinal heresy, but of revolt and separation and breach of unity upon a purely ecclesiastical question.

A Non-Juror's Letter

Law often speaks of the "one Church out of which there are no covenanted terms of salvation." In the Catholic Church the, so to speak, common law of "*extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*" is tempered by the equitable doctrine that many belong to the soul of the Church who do not belong to its body, and by the doctrine of "invincible ignorance." Moreover, another article of the Apostles' Creed, the Communion of Saints, is, perhaps, capable of far wider unfolding than it has yet received.

William Law often uses the word "schism" in arguing that the word is no longer applicable to the facts. The word is not much used at the present day. It is felt that a term justly applicable to the men who led the revolt from the Catholic Church is less applicable to the innocent inheritors of the separation. This differs, of course, from Law's view that there are no schismatics because there is no longer a visible Catholic Church.

William Law's unpublished letter is written with all his usual extreme lucidity and anxiety that there shall not be a shade of doubt as to his exact meaning, involving some repetition. He says :

"The many separate communions of those who call themselves Christians, having well-nigh rendered the Church of God (that city upon an hill) invisible; I have had many anxious thoughts with myself concerning my own state, frequently doubting whether I am in such external communion with the Church as to be thereby made a true member of the Body of Christ.

"The great piety, and great learning of men of different communions, who equally assert the right of their respective Churches, makes it impossible for me to yield to the judgment of one rather than another, so that in this inquiry I have no body of people to follow as a guide, but am forced to appeal to my own reason, which I cannot help distrusting in a matter where such numbers of learned men are equally positive on the contrary sides. This was not the case in the primitive times, for from the first foundation of Christianity to the times of St. Austin, there was no difficulty in this point. The one Catholic

A Non-Juror's Letter

Church was as visible as Christianity itself. The divisions that then happened never obscured the sight of the Catholic Church ; it was then as easily seen from any separate communion as a church is now from any common building. It is still plainly to be seen from the records of Antiquity and the Writings of learned men what that unity was, upon what principles it was founded, and by what laws and practices it was preserved.

“ I fully believe this article of the Christian faith, viz., that there is but one Holy Catholic Church. The state of Christianity is confined to this one Church, the number of Christians is no larger than the members of this one Church. This is as certain as that Christ has instituted but one religion, whose doctrines and institutions are not observed unless they unite us into one Body. The same offices performed, the same institutions observed, but in opposition to this one Body, have no pretence to the blessings of Christianity. A Church set up against the one Church of Christ is but like any other worship that is contrary to that which Christ has appointed. Any person that should set himself up to be received in Christ's stead, ought to be renounced as Antichrist. And whatever communion is set up against, or instead of the one Church of Christ, ought to be looked upon as anti-Christian.

“ I am fully persuaded that the unity or oneness of the Church consists in the unity of its external communion, when every part of the Church communicates with every other part of it, as fellow-members of the same Body. I firmly believe that our Non-juring Fathers and Brethren in their writings justly explained the unity and principles of the primitive Church. Had they lived in the times of St. Cyprian, or St. Austin, the principles which they now assert, would have rendered them at that time good Catholics. But, then, it may happen that a right knowledge of what the Catholic Church did, and might do, in the primitive times, may be the occasion of wrong practices and false claims in the present state of the Church.

A Non-Juror's Letter

“For instance, if a person, seeing how the Church asserted its powers in St. Cyprian's days, should therefore think that that particular communion to which he belongs might assert the same powers, and claim the same rights ; if he should think that the particular Church of which he is a member might treat all other Churches from which it is divided in the same manner as the Church treated all separations from itself in St. Cyprian's days, it is certain that such an one would be betrayed into very wrong practices by his own knowledge of Antiquity. For if any particular Church at this present time could justly treat all other communions that are separate from it as the Church did in St. Cyprian's days, it must be for this reason because that particular Church as distinguished from all others, is in the same manner the one Catholic Church, as the Church was in St. Cyprian's days.

“If, therefore, any particular Church at this time can show that it is in the same manner the one Catholic Church, as that was of which St. Cyprian was a member, then it may be granted that such a Church has a right to treat all other communions as St. Cyprian did all separations from, or opposition to, that Church of which he was a member. But then, on the other hand, if there is now no one particular Church that is thus the one Church of Christ, as the Church was one in the primitive times ; then it follows that, if any one particular Church pretends to act with such powers towards all other communions, as the one Church acted towards all separations from itself, then it undeniably follows that such a Church will render itself schismatical by imitating the Catholic Church.

“And thus, Sir, you see how the very knowledge of orthodox principles may lead people into heterodox practices, which I am afraid will be found to be very much the case of our modern divisions. For, if you go to the chief heads and abettors of any particular Church, if you ask them how they come to condemn all communions but their own, why they treat them as schismatical, they will answer you : Because the Church is but one, and it

A Non-Juror's Letter

thus treated all separate communions in the primitive times. If you ask them again why you may not communicate with other Churches, why you may not receive their sacraments, the answer will be: Because the Church in St. Cyprian's days treated all separate communions as synagogues of Satan, and looked upon sacraments administered in schism to be no better than sacrilegious usurpations.*

"If a society of Presbyterians should take upon them to apply all the principles of the Cyprianic age to themselves, condemning and censuring all other communions, as the Church then condemned and censured all separations from itself, we should easily see the folly of such claims. We should see that a body of people, so different from that one body that was then the Catholic Church, had no right to treat all other communions as the Cyprianic Church treated all communions divided from it. Now, that which appears to be thus absurd in a body of Presbyterians may be equally absurd in an Episcopal society. For if the Episcopal society is not the one Church of Christ, out of which there is no covenanted terms of salvation; if it is not the one Catholic Church of Christ, as that was the one Catholic Church of Christ of which St. Cyprian was a member, then it plainly follows that if this Episcopal society pretends to act towards all other communions as the one Catholic Church acted in St. Cyprian's day towards all communions separate from it, then, I say, it plainly follows that this society, though Episcopal, would act as unreasonably as the Presbyterian society just mentioned. For, although a Presbyterian society would want something essential to a Church, though an Episcopal society would have a great advantage over them in this respect, yet if the Episcopal society was not the one Catholic Church of Christ, as the Church of St. Cyprian was, and should nevertheless pretend to the same powers that the one

* This is hardly a correct statement. The Church of Rome upheld, against St. Cyprian's opinion, the validity of baptism (if in the correct form) administered by persons who were outside the Catholic Church, and this view was confirmed by the Council of Nicea some seventy years later.

A Non-Juror's Letter

Catholic Church then had, it would by so doing act as much against all reason and truth as any society that was merely Presbyterian.*

"Thus much, therefore, I think, is very plain: that no Church can claim those powers or privileges which the Church of St. Cyprian's age claimed, but because it is in the same manner the one Church of Christ, exclusive of all other communions, as that Church was in which St. Cyprian lived. It seems to me that most of the mistaken zeal which animates people in their respective communions is owing to their not attending to this distinction. A good man, who loves the Church and is well read in the principles of the Cyprianic age, is easily led to think that he cannot have too strict a regard to such orthodox time, and therefore he zealously asserts the same things of his particular Church which were then said of the one Catholic Church, and pronounces the same things against all other Churches, which the one Catholic Church then pronounced against separate communions.

"I readily own that the Catholic Church is truly and excellently described by the late reverend and learned Dr. Hicks in that piece that was printed after his death. His principles are taken from the purest Antiquity, and set forth the Church as it was in the days of St. Ignatius, Irenæus, Cyprian, etc. But, then, if these very principles were only then just and good because of the state that the Church was then in, it must follow that they will be neither just nor good but when there is the same foundation for them in the state of the Church that there was then.

"For instance, it was a good and just practice in the then Church to declare all communions that were set up against it to be schismatical, and out of the terms of salvation. And the reason was because the Church that then exercised this power and made this declaration, was

* "If the Episcopal society was not the one Catholic Church of Christ." Law's argument all depends upon this. If it were that one Church, the logic brings one to the opposite conclusion.

A Non-Juror's Letter

confessedly the one Church of Christ, exclusive of all other Churches, or societies. But, then, if a principle, thus good and just because of this foundation for it in the primitive Church, is in any after times made use of by any particular Church which cannot be the one Church of Christ as that was, then it is certain that this principle, which was good and just in the primitive Church, must be bad and unjust, and the occasion of schism, when so exercised by any particular Church. For, if no particular Church now in the world can, with any show of reason, affirm that its communion is the one Catholic Church of Christ, then no particular Church now in the world can claim those powers and benefits which were justly claimed by the Catholic Church in the days of St. Cyprian. And, therefore, the principles of the Cyprianic age cannot be strictly maintained by any particular Church now in the world without great error and mistake. For if any particular Church now in the world should declare that of all other communions which the Church in St. Cyprian's days might justly declare of all communions separate from itself, such particular Church would certainly be chargeable with great schism.*

"The short of the matter is this : It is plain that the Church as instituted by Christ is one society of Christians united in the worship of God. Whoever they are who depart from this society, or set up other communions against it, are not of that one Church that Christ instituted, and consequently not within the covenanted terms of salvation. It is plain also that this Church of Christ continued to be one visible society for several ages, acting by such laws and rules of discipline as made the unity of the Church visible to all the world. The one Church of Christ being then as plain and notorious as any temporal kingdom is now. If, therefore, a man had lived in those days, it is easy to say what he ought to have thought of the Church and what he ought to have thought

* Everything in the above sentences turns on the word "if." We assert that, although many particular Churches have broken off from it, the Catholic Church centred in the Chair of St. Peter at Rome has existed from the days of St. Cyprian to these.

A Non-Juror's Letter

of any separation from it.* But the case is : What rules of discipline are to be followed, and what a man is to do now, when the state of Christianity is quite changed in the world ; when, instead of seeing one Catholic Church all over the world, you see every part of the Christian world divided from every other part. Every single Church condemning all other communions in the same language, as the one Catholic Church condemned all communions that were separate from it. Now, if the Church of Christ is no longer one society, if the state of Christendom is nothing else but a state of division, as it plainly is in fact, then it is as plain that the laws and principles of the primitive Church are out of date, and must continue to be so till such time as the Church is restored to its unity.

“ As, for instance, had I lived in the days of St. Cyprian, when the Church was one society, plainly distinguished from every other communion, then I ought to have looked upon it as a necessary principle and law of my behaviour to communicate only with this one Church, and to join in no offices with those that are separate from it. But, then, these are laws and principles that last no longer than the unity of the Church lasteth, and can only be restored when the Church is restored to its unity. For, if the one Catholic Church is made invisible by division, if there is no one particular communion in this divided state that can be called the one Catholic Church of Christ, out of which there is no covenanted terms of salvation, then it is plain that the laws and principles of the primitive Church concerning schism, and schismatical communion, can be no certain laws for my behaviour at this time. For, as there is no particular Church that signifies the same thing now that the one Catholic Church did signify then, so neither do the divided societies of Christians signify the same thing now that the divisions and schisms signified then in the times when the one Catholic Church existed.

* The controversies of St. Augustine show that it was not at all easy for hereditary Donatists to know what they ought to think on these questions.

A Non-Juror's Letter

"For instance, let it be supposed that the Grecian, or Roman, or English Churches are schismatical in the laws and terms of their communion, yet are they not in such a state of schism as they were who were separated from the Church in the primitive times when there was one visible Catholic Church. For, though any of these Churches, Grecian, Roman, or English, should be proved to be schismatical in their tenets and terms of communion, yet it cannot be shown that any of these particular Churches are divided from any one visible Church, which is the only Church of Christ, and out of which there is no covenanted terms of salvation, whereas this was the very thing that made the guilt and danger of schisms in the primitive times. Their whole nature consisted in this : that they were separations from that one visible Church out of whose communion there was no covenanted terms of salvation.

"Now, Sir, there being evidently this great change in the state of Christendom from what it was in the primitive times, from whence all our laws of discipline are taken, it is plain that those laws which were founded on the unity of the Church cannot be laws in the same manner when that unity is become invisible. That this change hath happened, I suppose, needs no proof. It being as plain a matter of fact as that France and England are two kingdoms.* We of the English Church disregard the declarations of the Church of Rome against us, and the reason is that we don't look upon that Church to be the one Church of Christ, out of which there is no covenanted terms of salvation. Now that which makes the Church of Rome want power with regard to us, must have the same effect with every other particular Church ; it must make it without any power as to every other communion divided from it. And thus it must be with every other Church, till there appear such a one as, exclusive of all others, is the one only Church of Christ, within

* It is a plain matter of fact that, *e.g.*, the Episcopal Church of Sweden or that of England, is divided from the Church which has its centre at Rome. It does not follow that the latter Church is not the one true Catholic.

A Non-Juror's Letter

whose communion the means of salvation are alone to be found.

"It may, perhaps, now be said : If there has been this great change in the state of Christendom, if this change has destroyed many laws of the primitive Church concerning Church communion, how shall we know how to conduct ourselves in our present state ? May we proceed by new laws of our own making ? In order to set this matter in its true light, let us first make use of this supposition : Let it be supposed that there is a person instructed in the true principles of the primitive Church, and that he fully apprehends the nature of its unity, and its laws of discipline, but has not yet seen any Christian Church upon earth. Let us suppose that he is carried about in the air and shown every part of Christendom. Now, if he has the idea of the primitive Church, as one Episcopal society, maintaining its unity by such and such laws of discipline ; if he has this idea in his head when he is shown the several divided Churches of Christendom, he will certainly take them all to be schismatical societies, separated from that one Church of Christ which he had before heard of, and which he would suppose was in some place or other which he had not yet seen.* But when he was told that there was no other Christendom upon earth, but this which he had seen, and that he must enter into some part of it in order to Christian salvation, what do we think he would then do ? Can we suppose that he would take all the divided parts of Christendom to be one visible Church of which he had been informed ? This is too absurd to be supposed. Can we think that he would pick out some one society of Christians, in some corner of the world, whom he would call the one Church of Christ, to whose communion, exclusive of all others, the means of salvation were confined ? Yet, unless he did one of these, unless he took all the divided, quarrelling societies of Christians to be one undivided Church of

* The aerial traveller would find, on closer inquiry, that there was one Church, not limited to any region or race of men, but to be found in some degree in every race and region.

A Non-Juror's Letter

Christ, or some one of these societies to be the one Church exclusive of all others, he could neither use the word Church nor the word Schism according to their true meaning in primitive times. When the Church signified the one Church of Christ, and Schism signified separation from that one Church.

“What, therefore, can it be supposed that such a man would do? He cannot see the Church that had been described to him. It has no visibility. And yet he must enter into some society of Christians. Now, as he would know that Christianity is to last till Christ's Second Coming, so he would know that the means of salvation must still continue in the world, and that therefore this Church of Christ, though thus changed, corrupted, divided, and broken in pieces, was still the means of salvation to the world. Again, as he would know that the means of salvation were still in the Church, and as he would see that the unity of the Church had failed, so he must necessarily come to this conclusion, that the means of salvation are now to be had in the Church rather as a sect professing the substance of Christianity than as a society at union with itself. Now, as he would plainly see that in all the Episcopal Churches throughout the world the substance of Christianity was still to be had, whether in Greece, or Rome, or England, or Sweden, or elsewhere, and that consequently Christian salvation was to be had in any of them, he would content himself to be a member of any of them, as necessity should require, only protesting against such errors, corruptions, and uncharitable terms of communion as keep them separated from one another. But if he was left to his choice, to enter into what part of the Church he would, whether in Greece, France, or England, he would then choose to communicate with that society where the doctrines and discipline of Christianity are best preserved, and where there are the fewest impediments to him, still declaring against all such corruptions and dividing principles as keep that society separate and divided from other Churches professing the substance of Christianity.

A Non-Juror's Letter

"There seems to me no other way in nature for this person to act. As he cannot go to any communion that is the one only Church of Christ, exclusive of all other communions; as he must allow the means of salvation to be existing in all the divided Episcopal societies, so he cannot possibly hold communion to be unlawful in any of them. There remains, therefore, no distinction but that of preference. I may choose one before another, but have no right to condemn the other as an unlawful communion. I may prefer the Greek to the English, or the English to the Latin Church, as having fewer corruptions, or administering better helps to salvation; but if I condemn all others as parts not fit to be communicated with, as societies that are out of the Church, I then become a schismatic in the fullest sense of the word.

"You will, perhaps, now ask me if I am ready to turn Romanist? I answer: I am not. But it is not because I hold communion with the Church of Rome to be unlawful, but because I cannot turn Romanist without renouncing and condemning the Church of England in such a manner as I would not. But, for the same reason, if I was a member of the Church of France, I should, I believe, find it as difficult to become a Protestant, finding it as unreasonable to renounce the Church of Rome in such a manner as is required by the Protestant Churches. So that the uncharitable and bitter quarrels and the schismatical laws which one Church has made against another makes it very difficult for a person to remove from one communion to another, because he is on both sides required to submit to such terms and to renounce more than he ought to renounce, yet the communion itself, without these preliminary terms, may be held as lawful. So that anyone may fairly hold it lawful to communicate with the Church of Rome, although he is not ready to turn Romanist. And I freely own to you that if I was at Smyrna, in France, Russia or Sweden, I would join in prayers and receive the sacrament with a Greek, French or Russian priest, providing that I might do it without renouncing the Church of England in such a manner as

A Non-Juror's Letter

I would not renounce any Episcopal Church that I know of."

At this point of the letter William Law quotes a solemn declaration read by the "learned and pious Dr. Lee" upon the morning of Easter Sunday, April 13th, 1718, in his brother's oratory, after the offertory, and "addressed to his friend the Rev. M. D. there celebrating." This is too long to quote in this article, but its purport may be gathered from the concluding remarks in Law's letter, who then says :

"Now, Sir, I think it is very apparent from this declaration that this pious and learned man looked upon the Catholic Church as subsisting not in any one society of Christians as divided and distinguished by any faith or discipline from all other societies, but as still subsisting in them all, though all in various instances corrupted and degenerated from the original rule. He is afraid of being only a member of one society, or having only the benefits of any one communion, and therefore discharges himself of any such attachment by openly and solemnly declaring that it is his intention not to communicate with a part, but with the whole Body of the Universal Church.

"As much as to say that though he must, whenever he communicates, do it with some particular society or church of Christians, yet he does not so communicate with them as thereby to declare against, or renounce communion with, other societies or churches of Christians, but that his act of communicating in this little Oratory, with this small society of Christians, is thereby to communicate with all other societies of Christians, which constitute the whole Body of the Universal Church."

With these words William Law ends this letter. The intentions of men like Dr. Lee deserve sympathy and praise. But surely they had done better (as a few non-jurors did and many modern Anglicans have done) to unite themselves to that central, embodied, real, organic Church, unbrokenly descended from the Church

A Non-Juror's Letter

of Cyprian and Augustine, composed of, or existing in, all races and nations. It is, to say the least, the fully realized part of the Church Universal. Have not men like these been held back by mistaken, or rather, misplaced patriotism? In order to enter this Catholic Church they would, indeed, have to renounce expressly all doctrines contrary to its own. Some such contrary or defective doctrines are enshrined in the Articles of the Church of England, and were taught till recent times in the great majority of her pulpits, and are still taught in a minority. But a Catholicized Anglican, accepting the full sacramental doctrine, would have to abjure no doctrine previously held by himself, except his denial in action of the true Catholic faith as to the constitution of the Church, and his assertion of opposite or inconsistent or incomplete theories. He only has to make the true application of his theory. He has already virtually abandoned the positions held under Edward VI and Elizabeth; he is now in the last line of trenches, that held by Henry VIII, who wished to sever union with the Apostolic See, but to retain the rest of Catholic doctrine and discipline, a vain hope, as events soon proved. One step more, and the Catholicized Anglican will have quitted the false position of that monarch. And, in so far as the Church of his birth does hold Catholic doctrine, he will not have abjured her.

One with the realized body of the Universal Catholic Church, he could and would then feel that he was then also in spiritual communion with all true Christian, and even non-Christian souls—for these also, if they love and seek the divine centre of all things, and are servants of God, may be taken as belonging to the soul of the Church. For the soul of man is, in its inmost essence, Christian and Catholic, and every conversion is but a process of self-discovery. "*Le dernier effort de la persuasion est de faire croire aux hommes ce qu'ils croient.*" "What can you give us which we do not already possess?" said the Donatists. "We give you the Catholic Church," replied St. Augustine. According to Law, the Catholic Church,

A Non-Juror's Letter

in the sense of Augustine, had, since the days of Augustine, ceased to exist, so that now no one could give it to anyone. It now exists, in his view, only in the sense that a loaf of bread exists when divided into several parts. It is the same bread, but it does not exist as a whole. One has to choose between, on the one side, the kind of conception held by Law in his day, and by many, in some modified form, in this, and, on the other, the belief as to the existence and unity of the true Church, not only theoretic but actual, held in his day by Augustine, and in this by the world-wide society attached to the Chair of St. Peter. If one accepts the view of Law one must accept the belief that the "one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" no longer exists in the sense attached to those words by the bishops of the Council of Nicea, but only in another and very different sense. If this, which we deny, be granted, the logic of Law's argument is irresistible. But if, as we know, there is now, as ever, an one Catholic Church, opposed to separated bodies in East and West, just as in the Fourth Century there was an one Catholic Church opposed to separated national and episcopal African Churches and others, and if, as we hold, that Catholic Church is known by its allegiance to St. Peter's Apostolic See, then the foundation of Law's argument is gone. To those outside, the Catholic claim seems to be bold and presumptuous, and contrary to the facts of the case; but it is for us essential, and a question of "*stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ*."

BERNARD HOLLAND.

DANTE & SALVATION

Un uom nasce alla riva
dell' Indo, e quivi non è chi ragioni
di Cristo, nè chi legga, nè chi scriva ;

e tutti i suoi voleri ed atti buoni
sono, quanto ragione umana vede,
senza peccato in vita o in sermoni.

More non battezzato e senza fede ;
ov' è questa Justizia che il condanna ?
ov' è la colpa sua, s'egli non crede ?

*Par., xix, 70-8.**

IN these lines Dante demands of the Eagle in the Heaven of Jupiter, which is that of Divine Justice, an answer to a question which, he tells us, had tormented him for a long while ; he calls the period of his unsatisfied craving for a solution of it "*Il gran digiuno che lungamente m' ha tenuto in fame*"—the great fast which has long kept me hungering.

How can the formula, "*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*," be reconciled with the principle of Divine Justice ? The poet had already declared the solution of this problem to transcend human reason, when some years before he wrote in the *De Monarchia*, ii, 8 :

There are also certain judgments of God to which human reason, albeit unable to its proper strength, is nevertheless raised by dint of faith in what is said to us in the sacred writings ; as,

* For saidst thou : " Born a man is on the shore
Of Indus, and is none who there can speak
Of Christ, nor who can read, nor who can write ;

And all his inclinations and his actions
Are good, so far as human reason sees,
Without a sin in life or in discourse :

He dieth unbaptized and without faith ;
Where is this justice that condemneth him ?
Where is his fault, if he do not believe ? "

—*Longfellow.*

Dante and Salvation

for instance, this: That no one, however perfect in the moral and intellectual virtues, both as to disposition and practice, may be saved without faith, if he never heard aught of Christ. For human reason of itself cannot see that this is just, but helped by faith it may. For it is written: "Ad Hebraeos"—"Without faith it is impossible to please God."*

For the average mediæval Christian the question had, of course, as little interest as for the ordinary peasant of a Catholic country to-day. The extent of his knowledge of the non-Catholic world was too restricted for the problem of the eternal destiny of those who dwelt therein to affect him seriously.

Heresy, in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, was regarded rather as treason against the established order of things than as an intellectual attitude towards the Church, which a man might maintain in perfect good faith, and therefore something to be uprooted by the most drastic means, lest it corrupt the whole body of the Church. This had been the attitude of Innocent III, in whose person the Mediæval Papacy is justly regarded as typified, when, a hundred years before Dante, after all efforts to obtain their conversion by pacific means had failed, he reluctantly ordered a crusade against the Albigenses, his Legate having been murdered by a member of the household of the Count of Toulouse. Apart from the sporadic outbursts of heresy against which the machinery of the Inquisition was set in motion, and the Greek schism in the fast decaying Byzantine Empire, to heal which a fruitless attempt had been made by the Second Council of Lyons (1274), when Dante was only nine years old, the great antithesis to Catholicism throughout the Middle Ages was Islam, which constituted an ever-present menace. Southern Spain, Northern Africa, and South-Eastern Asia lay under its blight. Repelled in one quarter, it threatened Christendom in another.

Twenty-nine years before Dante's birth in 1236, St. Ferdinand III of Aragon had recovered Cordoba, the

* Trans. *De Monarchia*. Ed. Temple Classics, edited by Wicksteed.

Dante and Salvation

fruitful centre of Arab culture, for Christendom ; but thirty-six years after his death, the Turk, already possessed of the holy places of Christendom, was to plant the Crescent upon the European shores of the Hellespont. Scant as was the geographical knowledge of the time (and the Arab had attained to greater proficiency in this science than the Christians), Dante, who knew all the science that could be known in his day, knew that beyond the confines of Islam and Christendom there lay a great world of human beings whom the light of the Gospel had never reached. The Mongols, who had become converted to Buddhism, overran Eastern Europe in the Thirteenth Century, and during this period a certain amount of friendly as well as hostile intercourse took place between them and Christendom. Mongol chiefs even married into the imperial house of Palæologus, and their envoys appeared in Rome and at the Second Council of Lyons (1274), while Dante's countryman, Marco Polo, had spent many years at the court of the Great Khan. Frederic Ozanam considers that Dante had probably some acquaintance with the tenets of Buddhism : "*Dante surtout, avide de savoir, toujours en quête de traditions et de doctrines qui puissent trouver place dans l'ensemble de sa vaste composition poétique ; lui qui d'ailleurs avait dû plus d'une fois rencontrer, à la cour des princes, les députés tartares, n'avait pu manquer de s'enquérir de leurs croyances.*"—*Dante et la Philosophie Catholique au 13ième siècle*. He even cites some possible traces of Indian influence in the *Divine Comedy* :

Les brahmes représentent ce mont Meron comme le pivot du monde : à ses pieds rayonnent toutes les contrées habitées par les hommes et les génies ; au sommet est fixée la demeure terrestre des dieux. Ainsi la montagne du Purgatoire, décrite dans la *Divine Comédie*, fut le centre du continent primitivement destiné à l'habitation de l'homme ; elle est couronnée par les délicieux ombrages du Paradis terrestre. Le sombre empire d'Yama,* comme le royaume de Satan, est creusé dans les profondeurs souterraines, composé de plusieurs cercles qui

* The Hindu god of the lower world.

Dante and Salvation

descendent l'un au-dessus de l'autre en interminables abîmes, et dont le nombre, diversement rapporté par des mythologues, est souvent de neuf ou d'un multiple de neuf. Les tortures s'y rencontrent pareilles et affectées aux mêmes crimes : ténèbres, sables enflammés, océans de sang où les tyrans sont plongés, régions brûlantes auxquelles succèdent des régions glaciales. Au delà de ces points de contact superficiels, on découvre des rapports plus intimes. Telle est l'opinion singulière de Dante, d'après laquelle les âmes, détachées par la mort du corps qu'elles habitaient, sont revêtues d'un corps aérien. Cette hypothèse, plusieurs fois renouvelée dans la philosophie chrétienne, et empruntée au paganisme, ne se trouve nulle part avec des développements plus complets et des traits de ressemblance plus constants que dans les systèmes de l'Inde.

If Ozanam's conjecture, that the poet had some knowledge of Indian religious philosophy, is correct, this may perhaps have supplied him with the motive for making his type of the virtuous heathen a native of that country. There was, however, a second class of men, which, in relation to the Incarnation, stood in time in a position analogous to that occupied by the Indian in respect of place. This was the class which comprised the men who lived before Our Lord came, and which included the great spirits of classical antiquity, with whom Dante had communed so oft in spirit, though not in the flesh.

If we could examine the poet's answer to the question which confronts him, we must analyse his treatment of the non-Christians in the *Divina Commedia*. He held, as his creed taught him, that two destinies alone were possible to man. Either he must attain to the end for which he was created, the eternal enjoyment of the vision of God, or he must fail to attain that end. The non-Christians in the *Divine Comedy* fall, therefore, into two groups : a larger group in the *Inferno*, consisting of those who fail to attain to the object for which they are created, and a smaller one in the *Purgatorio* and the *Paradiso* who do attain to it. In each case, however, a few names only are mentioned, and nothing is said of the relative number of each. The teaching of the schoolmen

Dante and Salvation

which had modified the extreme severity of the Augustinian doctrine of original sin, enabled him to make a distinction between those who died in original sin alone and those who died in actual sin. Innocent III had taught this doctrine in a letter to the Archbishop of Arles, stating that the former would suffer "no other pain, whether from material fire or from the worm of conscience, except the pain of being deprived forever of the vision of God."* In accordance with this principle the unbaptized infants were placed, indeed, within the portals of the "*città dolente*," over which were written the awful words "*Lasciate ogni speranza, voi che entrate*" ("All hope abandon, ye who enter here"); but sadness without torment, "*duol senza martiri*," is their only punishment.

Though the *Divine Comedy* has been not inaptly called the "*Summa*" of St. Thomas put into verse, it is interesting to note that Dante, in his treatment of the unbaptized, differs in more than one point from the eschatology of the greatest of the schoolmen. He is more lenient towards unbaptized adults, but less merciful to unbaptized infants. The Angelic Doctor taught that the state of these would be one of natural happiness, and that, though excluded from the vision of God, they would be no more tormented at being deprived of this happiness than is a peasant at not being a king. This is certainly preferable to the "sadness without torment" to which the poet condemned them.† St. Thomas recognizes, besides, the *Limbus Infantium* in which unbaptized children enjoy a measure of natural happiness, the *Limbus Patrum* in which the saints of the Old Law were detained till the descent of Christ into Hell. The *Limbus Patrum*, according to St. Thomas, is above the *Limbus Puerorum*, and both are above Purgatory and Hell. It is permissible, however, to believe that they are side by side: In the *Limbus Patrum* there was rest through immunity from punishment, but not through immunity from desire;

* *Corpus Juris, Decret.* i, iii, tit. xlii, c. iii—majores.

† Bk. II, *Sententiarum Distinctio*.

Dante and Salvation

the Limbo of the Fathers was closed by Christ, and since then no one has entered therein. St. Bonaventura, to whose theological speculations Dante was also largely indebted, maintained a doctrine which did not differ materially from that of Aquinas. The Seraphic Doctor also divided Limbo into two parts, the upper, which he identified with the *Sinus Abrahamæ*, where the saints of the Old Law were confined until the descent of Christ into Hell, and the lower where are confined those who suffer eternally the pain of loss without the pain of sense. Dante follows neither of the great schoolmen in their separation of the *Limbus Patrum* from the *Limbus Puerorum*, and boldly departs from them in his creation of the *Limbus Philosophorum*, his humanistic sympathies making the problem of the spiritual state of the great stages of antiquity of more intimate personal interest to him than it was to St. Thomas or St. Bonaventura.

There is, indeed, one passage in the *Summa Theologica* which seems to indicate that Dante's solution of the problem of the fate of the adult heathen who lived before Christianity would scarcely have been acceptable to the Angelic Doctor*; theologians sometimes discussed what would happen after death to a person who, after attaining the age of reason, had neither committed a mortal sin, nor made a perfect act of charity, nor been baptized.

Not being in the grace of God, such a person, it was argued, could not go to Heaven; and, not being in actual mortal sin, he did not deserve Hell. Dante's guess at this difficulty is given in the words of Virgil, when, in reply to the question of the great Florentine, as to who are the

* The words in which St. Thomas rejects in anticipation Dante's theory that it is possible for an adult to be neither in a state of grace, nor yet in one of actual mortal sin, and so to suffer only the *Pæna Damni* without the *Pæna Sensus*, are these: "*Cum usum rationis . . . habere inceperet . . . primum quod tunc homini cogitandum occurrit est deliberare de seipso et si quidem seipsum ordinaverit ad debitum finem per consequitur remissionem originalis peccati; si vero non ordinet seipsum ad debitum finem secundum quod in illa ætate est capax discretionis, peccabit mortaliter, non faciens quod in se est.*"—*Summ. Theol.*, IIIæ, suppl. q. lxix, a. 7 ad 6^{um}; also Ia, IIæ, q. lxxxix, a. 6 (quoted from art. "Enfer," Vacant and Manganot, *Dictionnaire de la Théologie Catholique*).

Dante and Salvation

great crowd of men, women and children whom he sees in the outer circle of Hell, he says :

Now will I have thee know, ere thou go further,
That they sinned not ; and if they merit had,—
'Tis not enough, because they had not baptism
Which is the portal of the faith thou holdest ;
And if they were before Christianity,
In the right manner they adored not God ;
And among such as these am I myself.
For such defects, and not for other guilt,
Lost are we, and are only so far punished,
That without hope we live on in desire.

—*Inferno*, iv, 33-42.

Dante was filled with sadness at hearing this answer. After Virgil has described how the saints of the Old Law were liberated at the coming of Christ, we are told in the latter part of the canto, the names of some of those who, for original and not actual sin, are excluded from the Beatific Vision. The five great poets are mentioned : Virgil, Homer, Horace, Ovid and Lucan ; next, the inhabitants of the noble castle, heroes and heroines—Electra, Hector, Æneas, Cæsar, Camilla and Penthesilea, Labianus *il re latino*, and his daughter Lavinia, the Brutus who expelled the Tarquins, Lucretia, Julia Martia and Cornelia, and *solo in parte*, standing apart by himself, as not being a Roman or among the ancestors of the Roman people, the chivalrous Saladin. In another group are to be seen the philosophers, scientists and men of letters : Democritus, Diogenes, Anaxagoras and Thales, Empedocles, Heraclitus, Zeno, Discorides, Orpheus, Tully, Seneca, Euclid and Ptolemy, Hippocrates, Avicenna and Galen, Averrhoes "*che il gran comento feo*."

In surveying this list of pagans, placed by Dante in Limbo, we see at once that all the names in it do not fall within the category of those who were *dinanzi al Cristianesimo* ; they include certain names among the ancients, Galen and Ptolemy, and among Mohammedans, Saladin, Averrhoes and Avicenna, men who neither lived before Christianity nor were ignorant of it, and yet whom he

Dante and Salvation

held to have rejected it without mortal sin. Neither Galen, who lived at Rome as physician to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, nor Ptolemy, who conducted his observations at Alexandria during the Second Century, could have been without opportunity of acquainting themselves with the Christian Faith. Of the three Mohammedans who are also included in the same category, the first is the celebrated Sultan Saladin (1138-93), who represents the nobler side of the Arab character and who, throughout the Middle Ages, was regarded through Christendom as the ideal type of an Eastern potentate, just as the Assyrian king, Assur-bani-pal, under the name of Sardanapalus, typified to the Greeks the voluptuous Oriental despot, and as a type of Mohammedan piety, is allowed, in spite of his fierce hatred of the Cross, to have been in invincible ignorance. Dante's lenient treatment of him is perhaps due to his clemency towards the Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem, when he took the city in 1187.

The presence in Limbo of the two great Arabian philosophers and physicians, Averrhoes and Avicenna, whose chief interest for Dante is the impetus which their work gave to the popularization of the study of Aristotle in Europe, indicates that they, too, were regarded as heretics who had died in "good faith." The latter, born at Bokhara in 980 and dying at Hamadan in Persia in 1037, can have had little direct contact with Christianity, but Averrhoes (Twelfth Century), born at Cordoba and passing most of his life in Spain, stands well outside the category of those who lived before Christianity. The nobility of Averrhoes' character is admitted, but what is known of the private life of Avicenna gives rise to doubts as to whether Dante's lenient treatment of him is justified.

From the position which Dante assigns to these philosophers just mentioned, we may conclude that he held a doctrine which was certainly liberal for his time, namely, that it was possible for a man who lived after Christianity, and who had opportunities of acquainting himself with its dogmas, nevertheless to explicitly reject that creed while remaining in good faith, and thus committing no

Dante and Salvation

grave sin, so that he suffers merely the *pæna damni* or punishment of original sin, without incurring the *pæna sensus* or punishment of actual sin. St. Thomas made exception for the man living in "barbarous nations," but not for the man who had opportunity of acquainting himself with the Catholic Faith. Nevertheless, Dante held that there were limits even to invincible ignorance. Among the great sages of antiquity recounted in canto iv, we miss the figure of Epicurus, only to meet him in the sixth circle of Hell, where Virgil indicates to Dante the fiery tombs in which he and his followers are tormented because they denied the immortality of the soul.

Their cemetery have they upon this side
With Epicurus all his followers,
Who with the body mortal make the soul.*

In the *Canzoniere* Dante calls denial of the immortality of the soul, the worst of all forms of *bestialità*, stigmatizing it as "*stoltissima*," "*vilissima*," and "*damnosissima*"; from this we may infer that while he held that a man might remain in invincible ignorance of the truths of Christianity, it was impossible for him, without sin, to deny the truths of natural religion. Instead, therefore, of placing him among the other great philosophers in the Limbo of the righteous heathen, his eternal lot is cast with Farinata della Uberti, Cavalcante de Cavalcanti, Frederic II, Cardinal Ottaviano degli Ubaldini, Pope Anastasius II, and other heretics.

We learn, however, from the *Purgatorio* and the *Paradiso* that "*duol senza martiri*" was not the highest destiny which the poet believed could await the righteous heathen, and that attainment to the contemplation of the Beatific Vision was not regarded as impossible for him; this is shown by the fact that he appoints Cato as the guardian of Purgatory, while Trajan and the Trojan Rhipheus are already admitted to Heaven. "The example of Rhipheus in the *Paradiso*," says Dr. Edmund Gardner, "shows that Dante could have saved any of the ancients

* *Inferno*, x, 13-15.

Dante and Salvation

whom he chose without any violence to his creed.”* He points out that it was St. Thomas who rendered their salvation possible at all to Dante, when he wrote : “ Any-one can prepare himself for having faith through what is in natural reason ; whence it is said that, if any one that is born in barbarous nations does what lieth in him, God will reveal to him what is necessary for salvation, either by internal inspiration or by sending a teacher ” (*vel inspirando vel doctorem mittendo*).† Another distinguished Dante scholar, the Rev. Philip Wicksteed, though lamenting that “ Dante cannot free himself from the shackles of his creed and see Plato and Aristotle and Virgil sharing with Augustine and Aquinas and David the fruition of the Divine Aspect,” nevertheless also recognizes that it was St. Thomas who opened to him the door for the salvation of non-Christians. The presence of Rhipeus and Trajan among the just kings—David, Hezekiah, Constantine and William the Good, King of the Two Sicilies in the Heaven of Jupiter—is the answer to the question which Dante had put to the Eagle as to how God’s justice was to be vindicated amongst the heathen.

The Eagle indicates Trajan to the poet with the words :

Of five that make a circle for my brow
He that approacheth nearest to my beak
Did the poor widow for her son console ;
Nor knoweth he how dearly it doth cost
Not following Christ, by the experience
Of this sweet life and of its opposite.

—*Paradiso*, xx, 43-8.‡

Shortly after he points out the Trojan Rhipeus :

Who would believe, down in the errant world,
That o’er the Trojan Rhipeus in this round
Could be the fifth one of the holy lights ?

Now knoweth he enough of what the world
Has not the power to see of grace divine,
Although his sight may not discern the bottom ?

—*Ibid.*, 67-72.§

* *Dante Primer*. † *Dante’s Ten Heavens*. ‡ *Longfellow*. § *Longfellow*.

Dante and Salvation

Then the noble bird explains to Dante by what means
their salvation was wrought :

The first life of the eyebrow and the fifth
Cause thee astonishment, because with them
Thou seest the region of the angels painted.

They passed not from their bodies, as thou thinkest
Gentiles, but Christians in the steadfast faith
Of feet that were to suffer and had suffered.

For one from Hell, where no one ere turns back
Unto good will, returned unto his bones,
And that of living hope was the reward,

Of living hope that placed its efficacy
In prayers to God made to resuscitate him,
So that it were possible to move his will.

The glorious soul concerning which I speak
Returning to the flesh, where brief its stay
Believed in Him Who had the power to aid it ;

And in believing, kindled to such fire
Of genuine love, that at the second death
Worthy it was to come unto this joy.

The other one, through grace, that from so deep
A fountain wells that never hath the eye
Of any creature reached its primal wave,

Set all his love below on righteousness ;
Wherefore from grace to grace did God unlose
His eye to our redemption yet to be,

Whence he believed therein, and suffered not
From that day forth the stench of paganism
And he reproved therefore the folk perverse.

Those Maidens Three,* whom at the right-hand wheel
Thou didst behold, were unto him for baptism
More than a thousand years before baptizing.

—*Paradiso*, xx, 100-29.

* *Faith, Hope and Charity*, cp. *Purgatorio*, xxix, 121 ff.

Dante and Salvation

In discussing the salvation of Rhipeus, the Fourteenth Century commentator on Dante, Benvenuto da Imola, writes: "So now our author fitly introduces a pagan infidel in the person of Rhipeus, of whose salvation there would seem to be the very slightest chance of all; by reason of the place, for he was of Troy, where exceeding pride was then paramount; by reason of the sect, for he was a pagan and a Gentile, not a Jew. Briefly, then, our author wishes us to gather from this fiction this conclusion—that even such a pagan, of whose salvation none hoped, is capable of salvation."* The selection of Rhipeus as the type of the heathen who was saved before the coming of Christ is, of course, due to the lines in which Virgil speaks of his death: "*Cadit et Rhipeus, justissimus unus, qui fuit in Teneris, et servantissimus æqui.*" Except for one or two other scattered references in *Æneid*, ii, nothing else is known of him. In selecting him, however, as the only pre-Christian pagan whom he names as having already attained to eternal life (Cato is still in Purgatory), "Dante's main object," says Gardner, "is clearly to indicate that the race whom he regards as the ancestor of the Roman people were not without divine light," and "Dante, as it were, weaves in this description that Virgil gives of the Trojan's character with the text in Acts x.: 'In every nation he that feareth Him and worketh justice is acceptable to God'—"*In omni gente qui timet eum, et operatur justitiam, acceptus est illi.*"†

The question, of course, arises as to why Virgil, who is responsible by his eulogy for the salvation of Rhipeus, is not himself saved. Perhaps the most likely answer is the one suggested by Mr. Wicksteed, that it was due to tradition that St. Paul had wept over his tomb at Naples, which the Apostle would not have done had the poet been among the saved. The tradition was widely current in the Middle Ages, and Mr. J. A. Symonds‡ tells us that there were sung in the churches at Mantua, on the feast

* *Paradiso*, Temple Classics, 255.

† Quoted from Gardner, *Dante's Ten Heavens*, *ibid.*, p. 149.

‡ Symonds' *Renaissance in Italy*, Vol. II, p. 63.

Dante and Salvation

of St. Paul, the following lines commemorating the alleged event :

Ad Maronis Mausoleum
Ductus, fudit super eum
Piæ rorem lacrimæ ;
Quem te, inquit, reddidissem,
Si te vivum invenissem
Poetarum maximæ.*

The salvation of Trajan is brought about by quite different means, and does not come within the scope of those suggested by St. Thomas. It is, of course, due to the curious legend that Trajan, for his kindness to a widow, whose son had been slain, was rescued from hell by the prayers of St. Gregory the Great. The episode of Trajan's benevolence is related in *Purg.*, x, 73-93, where it is among the examples of humility drawn from sacred and profane history, which are carved upon the terrace of the first circle of Purgatory :

There the High glory of the Roman prince
Was chronicled, whose great beneficence
Moved Gregory to his great victory ;

'Tis of the Emperor Trajan I am speaking ;
And a poor widow at his bridle stood,
In attitude of weeping and of grief.

Around about him seemed it thronged and full
Of cavaliers, and the eagles in the gold
Above them visibly in the wind were moving.

The wretched woman in the midst of these
Seemed to be saying, " Give me vengeance, Lord,
For my dead son, for whom my heart is breaking."

And he, to answer her : " Now wait until
I shall return." And she : " My Lord," like one
In whom grief is impatient, " Shouldst thou not

* Mr. Symonds himself translates these lines :

" When to Maro's tomb they brought him
Tender grief and pity wrought him
To bedew the stone with tears ;
What a saint I might have crowned thee
Had I only living found thee
Poet first and without peers."

Dante and Salvation

Return ? ” And he : “ Who shall be where I am
Will give it thee.” And she : “ Good deed of others
What boots it thee, if thou neglect thine own ? ”

Whence he : “ Now comfort thee, for it behoves me
That I discharge my duty ere I move ;
Justice so wills, and pity doth retain me.”

The legend relates how the Pope, hearing of this episode, prayed that the Emperor might be delivered from Hell, and that his prayer was answered. Gregory himself, however, emphatically taught the uselessness of prayers for the damned, and St. Thomas maintains the same doctrine. “ The souls of the wicked will immovably cling to the end which they, too, have chosen for themselves. The will of the evil cannot become good.”* The only means, therefore, which remained by which the Emperor could be saved was that his soul should return to earth and be reunited to his body, and that during this second life he should be converted. This strange story is related by St. John Damascene† (died 751), and its credibility was discussed by theologians as late as the Seventeenth Century. Dante was probably indebted for his version of the story of Trajan and the widow, says Mr. Paget Toynbee, to the account given in the *Flore di Filosofi* (a compilation wrongly attributed to Brunetto Latini), which derives in its turn from that given by Vincent of Beauvais in the *Speculum Historiale*.‡

The salvation of Cato, whom we meet with as the guardian of Purgatory, was presumably brought about by the same means as that of Rhipeus. The startling selection of the Roman statesman as warden of the Christian Purgatory, has naturally given rise to much speculation as to its cause. “ Dante regarded the death of Cato,” says Dr. Moore, “ as an act of supreme self-sacrifice for liberty,”§ but he considers that his position was probably determined by Virgil’s estimate of him, who,

* *Summa contra Gentiles*, Bk. IV, ch. xciii. Trans. by J. Rickaby, *Of God and His Creatures*.

† *De His qui in Fide Dormierunt*, 16.

‡ *Dante Dictionary*, art. “ Trajano.”

§ *Scripture and Classical Authors in Dante*, 171.

Dante and Salvation

in speaking of the good separated from the evil in the next world, uses the words :

“ *Secretosque pios, his dantem
Jura Catonem.* ” — *Æneid*, viii.

And by the lines in Lucan's *Pharsalia* :

“ *Nam cui crediderim superos arcana daturos
Dicturosque magis quam sancto vera Catoni ?* ”

A problem of some interest is also raised by the question of why Cato, who took his own life at Utica, after the battle of Thapsus, 46 B.C., rather than fall into the hands of Cæsar, is numbered among the saved rather than condemned to dwell in the dismal forest, peopled by Pietro della Vigna, the disgraced chancellor of Frederic II, and others who had laid violent hands upon themselves, in the second ring of the second circle of Hell (*Inferno*, xiii). Other pagan suicides are treated leniently by Dante. The poet Lucan, who, at the early age of twenty-six, opened his veins on the discovery of the conspiracy of Piso against Nero, in which he was implicated, and the philosopher Empedocles, of whom a quaint legend related how he had cast himself into the crater of Mt. Etna, in the hope that men, unable to account for his disappearance, would believe that he had become a god, but that his ruse failed, as his sandals were emitted by an eruption of the volcano, are both met with in the Limbo of the virtuous heathen, their self-immolation not being regarded as a sin of sufficient gravity to involve them in a worse fate.

Dido, who also took her own life, is condemned to punishment in the second circle of Hell with Cleopatra, Helen and Francesca da Rimini, where carnal sinners are tormented by being incessantly whirled and smitten by a fierce storm ; but she is punished for violating the vow of chastity which she had sworn to the memory of her husband Sycharus, and not for her suicide (*Inferno*, v). From a consideration of these facts it seems, perhaps, not unreasonable to infer that Dante regarded the unlawfulness of suicide as a postulate of the moral law of which pagans might well remain in ignorance. If a Father of the

Dante and Salvation

Church, like St. Jerome, who regarded it as an expedient permissible to a virgin to safeguard her chastity,* might err in good faith upon this point, how much more so might not a pagan statesman? "In no question of morality," says Professor Westermarck, "was there a greater difference between classical and Christian doctrines than in regard to suicide."†

Dante never extenuates suicide in a Christian, and, indeed, both St. Augustine and St. Thomas are emphatic upon its unlawfulness, while Christian moralists have ever pointed out its peculiar heinousness, in that of all sins, it alone leaves no time for repentance.

The great African Doctor in the *De Civitate Dei* censures, as being due to weakness rather than courage, the act of Cato in taking his own life, which Dante regarded as one of devotion to the cause of liberty, and contrasts the conduct of Regulus, who courageously returned to Carthage to meet with a cruel death at the hands of his country's enemies, rather than violate his oath, favourably with that of Cato, who feared to fall into the hands of Cæsar.

The only other pagan besides Cato, Trajan and Rhipeus, who is explicitly mentioned in the *Divine Comedy* as being saved is the Roman poet, Statius (c. A.D. 45-96), who, by a poetic fiction, is represented as having been converted to Christianity before his death, through reading Virgil's "Messianic" eclogue (*Purg.*, xxii, 67-75). The purpose of this fiction is a puzzle to commentators, but Dr. Moore suggests that "Dante may have intended to create a type of this intermediate condition between Virgil and Beatrice, between the highest type of pre-Christian intellect, or merely human reason, and the fullest development of the soul enlightened by the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which are imparted by revelation and dogmatic theology."§ Having surveyed his treatment of the heathen in the *Divine Comedy*, we are in a position to construct some theory as to his answer

* *Commentary on Jonah*, i, 12.

† *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*.

‡ I, 24.

§ *Ibid.*, 30.

Dante and Salvation

to the question which has long tormented him : How was he to prevent his joy in his faith from being clouded by the thought of the eternal destiny of those ever in majority of mankind who die out of communion with the Vicar of Christ ? From the *Paradiso* we may conclude that of those who were to gaze for all eternity upon the Divine Essence, he held that the greater number would be from among those who lived in the light of the Jewish and the Christian revelations. Nevertheless, he held, as the cases of Cato and Rhipeus show, that some who were not Catholics, even some of those of whose salvation there seemed to be least chance, would also be saved. These exceptions opened the door to the admission of the great principle that those who diligently followed the light of conscience, no matter in what sphere of existence their earthly lot was cast, were in reality members of the Church's "soul." It is the same principle which Justin Martyr had upheld more than a thousand years before, when he wrote :

καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγον βιώσαντες Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, κἂν ἄθεοι. ἐνομισθησαν, οἷον ἐν Ἑλληνισμῷ Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς.

—*Apology*, i, 46.

Nevertheless, Dante seems to have held it was not possible for the majority of men living in an atmosphere impregnated by false religious beliefs and ethical values, to follow the light of conscience so consistently and to attain by the light of reason to such a degree of religious truth, as to procure for themselves the remission of the guilt of original sin, and, consequently, to attain to eternal life. Rather does he make of Cato and Rhipeus types of exceptional souls favoured by God with extraordinary graces, and exemplifying His mercy even to those who are living under conditions most prejudicial to the prospect of their salvation. But what of the great majority of the non-Christian world which was to be excluded from the "Beatific Vision ?" It seems clear, from *Inferno*, canto iv, that he held that the punishment of a great part of this would not be severe. If we are right

Dante and Salvation

in attaching the significance we have done to his treatment of pagan suicides, we may conclude that he held that these would be judged merely by their fidelity to such part of the moral law as they were capable of understanding. His deliberate exclusion, however, from Paradise, of most of the non-Christian philosophers, poets and heroes, seems to imply that he felt that the majority of them, while not having attained to a sufficient degree of virtue as to merit the "Baptism of desire," had, nevertheless, not sinned so grievously as to deserve the "pain of sense" suffered by the lost souls in the lower circles of Hell. This was a spiritual condition which, as we have seen, St. Thomas declared to be psychologically impossible, but we must remember that in estimating the value of his conclusion on this point the *a priori* character of his reasoning, and his lack of any first-hand knowledge of the effects of a pagan environment on the human conscience, must also be taken into account.

Dante allowed a wide range to invincible ignorance. It excused not merely those who could know nothing of Christianity, but also those who, like Galen, Ptolemy, Saladin and Averrhoes, had plenty of opportunity of acquainting themselves with its doctrines, but had nevertheless rejected that religion in good faith. He appears, however, to have held that there were limits to the range of invincible ignorance. It excused only those who rejected the truths of revealed religion; a man could not, without sin, reject the truths of natural religion, as is indicated by his treatment of the Epicureans who denied the immortality of the soul. The same principle applied to ignorance of the moral laws; no man could be ignorant of its first principles. Hence those pagans who had broken such of its precepts as they were capable of understanding are, according to him, punished with the unfaithful Christians in the "hell of fire," not because they were pagans, but because they sinned against the light they had.

In his attitude towards the heathen, Dante seems to warn the Catholic, who finds it hard to know how to combine a just appreciation of all that is noble in the

Dante and Salvation

lives of those outside the Church with a due recognition of the uniqueness of his own religion, against the danger of two extremes ; on the one hand, the harsh fanaticism of Tertullian, who, when he exclaims in the well-known passage in the *De Spectaculis* with which Gibbon has made us all familiar by reproducing it in the fifteenth chapter of the *Decline and Fall*, "How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many proud monarchs and fancied gods, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness ; so many magistrates, who persecuted the name of the Lord, liquefying in fiercer fires than they ever kindled against the Christians, so many sage philosophers blushing in red-hot flames, with their deluded scholars," etc., appears to regard the pagan world merely as fuel to keep alight the flames of hell, and the spirit of the Renaissance, which obliterated all distinction between Christian and pagan ethics, and under whose influence Erasmus, in his letter to Christianus of Lübeck, *Of the method of study*, is able to speak of the Imperial stoic as "St. Aurelius."

Dante does not appear to consider that his faith compelled him to hold that the overwhelming majority of his fellow-beings would be for eternity condemned to the most excruciating torments, a proposition which is even now held to be an integral doctrine of the Catholic Faith, not merely by uneducated and half-educated persons, but even by writers and thinkers of European reputation. Whether his solution of the difficulty of how to uphold the claims of an exclusive religion, and at the same time to vindicate the justice and mercy of God towards those who, through no fault of their own, do not belong to it, would in all its details be found acceptable by modern Catholic theologians, it is beyond the competence of the present writer to answer ; but, in conclusion, it may not be without interest to consider how far Dante's views are borne out by the few subsequent decrees of Popes and Councils bearing on this point. In the century after Dante's death, the formula of reunion with the Greeks, drawn up by the Council of Florence and promulgated

Dante and Salvation

in the Bull *Lætentur Cæli* of Eugenius IV, contains these words: "*Illorum autem animas, qui in actuali mortæ peccato vel solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, pænis tamen disparibus puniendas.*" (Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, 588.) The words "*disparibus pænis*" justify Dante's treatment of the righteous heathen in *Inferno*, iv.

In the following century, among the seventy-nine propositions of the Flemish theologian, Michael Baius, which were anathematized by St. Pius V (1567), the twenty-fifth one was, "*Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata, et philosophorum virtutes sunt vitia*"; which principles, if allowed, would also cut the ground from under Dante's feet in his treatment of the righteous heathen. Baius' doctrine sowed the seeds of Jansenism, which was to settle like a blight on the French Church in the reign of the "Great King," and taint the theological outlook even of the saintly Bishop of Meaux.

The twenty-ninth of the one hundred propositions retracted from the *Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament* of the Jansenist leader, Pasquier Quesnel (1634-1719), which was condemned by Pope Clement XI (Albani) in the Bull "*Unigenitus, Extra Ecclesiam nulla conceditur gratia*" (Denzinger, 1244). If this proposition were true, the salvation of Rhipeus, as described by Dante, would have been impossible. In conclusion, we may mention the oft-quoted words of Pope Pius IX, which defend the belief in the wide range of invincible ignorance recognized by Dante five and a half centuries before: "It is known to us, and to you, that those who labour under an invincible ignorance concerning our most holy religion, and who zealously observe the Natural Law written by God in the hearts of all men, can, with the aid of divine light and grace, attain to Eternal Life"; and "Who will dare to draw the limits of such ignorance, in view of the existing immense variety of peoples, minds, and so many other circumstances?"*

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON.

* Baron Frederick von Hügel, *Eternal Life*, 351.

COVENTRY PATMORE

NO more curious problem is offered to criticism than the disregard in which Coventry Patmore continues to be held. Much depends upon its resolution, for it is not difficult to show that *The Angel in the House*, admittedly a stumbling-block to all critics, is in fact a touchstone of taste. From Edmund Gosse to Arthur Symonds among contemporaries, from Carlyle to Ruskin and Tennyson among the men of his own day, the same uneasy apology is made for it. Even she, who understands his aims better than any, in discussing its realism once faltered in her own defence. If *The Angel in the House* is admitted to be the only example of a modern epic, if it was *The Angel* which made Patmore's name, *The Angel* was also the tomb of his reputation. Its temporary popularity (as a novel in verse) gave to the critics an excuse for their first doubt, and, sad to say, the unpopularity of his last verse, *The Unknown Eros*, is held to provide the justification for that earlier, foolish criticism. By the publication of *The Unknown Eros*, therefore, Patmore merely set the tombstone on his own grave, so far as the critics were concerned, and that ecstatic verse is apparently so "eccentric" from the cycle of song which it succeeded, that it is with a sigh of relief that the critics are able to carry out their interior intention, the intention, namely, to praise the lyrical odes at the expense of *The Angel*, thereby to deny to the only possible candidate the rank of a modern epic poet.

Experience has shown that it is hopeless to invite readers to turn to *The Angel in the House* until their minds have been prepared for the shock which there awaits them. Critical cant and insincerity are affronted on the doorway; vulgarity is rebuked by a composure more freezing than its own frown. For everything which is ignorantly supposed to be an attribute of art, the whole stage-property of poetry, is religiously excluded. The very title warns the amateur away. Need I mention the gross charge of sentimentality under which the

Coventry Patmore

whole poem is buried ? Need I recall that the title is quoted as the evidence in epitome of that charge ? What need of further witnesses ? It is therefore time to remember that it was Scott, not Patmore, who foisted the "Ministering Angel" upon us, and that it was not Patmore who made odious the smirk and sentimentality of the nurse, from which the strong soul of Florence Nightingale turned away in sarcasm and scorn. Under the circumstances, the title was unfortunate if success was to be consulted ; but Patmore had more important objects in view than to make things easy for ignorant readers. Did he not say in after years :

The only kindness wise can show to fool
Is firm to hold him on the whipping-stool.

The Angel has done that for half a century. He used the word "Angel" in its strict theological sense, for he was accustomed to write with precision, and was more anxious, since no other term existed for his purpose, to use the right word than to conciliate the wrong reader. All great poetry has to be earned. Therefore all that I shall try to do is not to lard the argument with quotations, nor to summarize the philosophy which knits his entire works together with a wedding ring (that I have done elsewhere), but to show the temper in which this epic must be approached, and to leave illustrations to the idlers. The principles which underlie the composition of the epic, obedience to which is its peculiar glory, the habit of mind indicated by their adoption, are the simplest, therefore the convincing, points to seize. It is, and seems likely to remain, the only epic of the present era, and its unpopularity is entirely due to the fact that it was written as Homer, Chaucer or Dante would have written had they been equally single-minded in their choice and significance of theme. For no one else had attempted the task which Patmore set before him : the theme of married love had always been felt to be too simple to be sung.

Coventry Patmore

The song of passion is as old as Solomon and Sappho. War and death were familiar themes to Deborah, David, and Homer. Pilgrimages and adventure were as fascinating to the writer of the Odyssey as to Chaucer himself. Heaven and Hell were ancient themes before Dante touched them. But to your even Christian, married love had never seemed a possible subject till Patmore married it to epic verse. The decision of the Provençal courts of Love is famous. This reason, the absence of models, no less than the nature of the subject itself, led him to adopt the simplest of metres. Any more elaborate measure would have been unworthy of the simplicity of the theme. The wonder is that his luck was not overdone. The opportunity was staggering in its simplicity. We need not discuss whether Patmore fulfilled his own intention, for that has hardly been denied. We need remark only that it was precisely his intention which dictated his treatment, and that it is the intention (the subject) not the treatment (its details) which is in reality despised. The great and persistent error has been to judge the style of Patmore's epic apart from its subject, and to pretend that a violent recoil from the subject is only a recoil from the style.

His intention was so simple that it cannot be *seen* by anyone who does not share it. That is why its mere statement turns men critically to stone. It was, once more, to take the simplest fact in the world, the love of a man for his wife, and so to meditate upon it as to provide a lover's breviary, an illuminated manuscript or enchiridion for every Christian lover in the world. Nor is this a book merely for the Christian lover, except in the paradoxical sense of Tertullian when he cried "*naturaliter Christiana*" of the soul. The dramatic author of the Song of Songs would find much of his own coin hidden there, and even the man in the suburbs who finds refreshment in such poor stuff as that of Omar Khayam, will find a means of escape from the ennui of his Desert in the intensity and poetic wit of its Preludes.

Coventry Patmore

Would not this serve as an epitaph on Omar :

An idle poet here and there
Looks round him, but for all the rest
The world, unfathomably fair,
Is duller than a witling's jest.

If then love was the theme, it was love in all its phases, and he is not fit to be called a lover who mistakes the overture for the theme. To Patmore love was the ever-renewed revelation, and the moment of falling in love the supernatural occurrence which once at least lights *every* man on his coming into the world. Its phases from first to last therefore formed for him the great Myth which is Nature, in which therefore every mood and incident in courtship, in marriage, in the home, in the nursery is at once both a symbol and a fact. On this he built the only thematic philosophy of love, in which the soul and the senses are equally satisfied, that the world has known. Plato is his only peer. But it was Patmore's achievement to remember one fact which Plato forgot, namely that Eros, the divine child, is *par excellence* the Domestic Deity. This, the great simplicity, could be presented only by unfolding an ordinary courtship in all its details, and ordinary marriage with all its trials, and by showing that this drama, as constant and recurring as the seasons, has, like the seasons, a significance which is supreme. As they are ordered, it is ordered ; as they are patent, it is plain ; as they, because of their simplicity, are taken for granted, it is, by virtue of a greater simplicity, not so much disregarded as denied. For a thousand who will echo the statement God is Love, hardly one seems to believe it, because when you repeat the statement to affirm that a human lover is, in virtue of his vision, God-like, people immediately recoil from that truth. Profession is not faith. That, I suppose, is the reason that faith has been defined to mean the making evident of things *not* seen. To some extent, counsellors within the Church herself have hesitated ; for while, with a child-like simplicity, she has included

Coventry Patmore

The Song of Songs in the Canon, the mystical glosses written upon it by centuries of saints and mystics sometimes seem to mean more to them than the *ipsissima verba* of its own sacred text. Patmore's real original contribution to Christian mystical literature was to supply the emphasis, elsewhere lacking, on the divine nature of human love. Patmore had the foregoing thought in his mind when he wrote to a friend: "The Incarnation is still only a dogma: perhaps it will take thousands of years to work into the feelings as it must do before religion can become matter of Poetry." This explains his own insistence on human love, the exquisite intimacy of his knowledge of the body, the lover's touch in him when he mentions its inexhaustible beauty; in a word his feeling for natural, physical fact. "The natural first, and afterward the spiritual," he repeated. So *The Angel* was the base and the strophe, *The Unknown Eros* only its epode. Unless related to *The Angel*, as *Paradise Regained*, in idea, is related to *Paradise Lost*, *The Unknown Eros* would rank only with the work of Crashaw or Francis Thompson, who, fine as they were, no one can regard for a moment to be of epic rank. It is on the epic, which includes both masterpieces, that Coventry Patmore sits enthroned.

Now men have given to the epic poet a standing denied to the lyric or the elegiac, just as they have accorded to tragedy the place of honour over comedy. What is the character of an epic? The epos in the word. It is to poetry what the logos is to religion. This is why it is not idle to refer to "the thunder of the Odyssey," nor to observe why the latest of the world's epics has in turn undeniably the quality of "a still small voice." An epic poem is that "which celebrates in the form of a continuous narrative the achievements of one or more heroic personages." The first such were Adam and Eve: the first man and the first woman, or still more simply, a man and his wife, the simplest and most symbolic subject in the world. Observe, then, that these are of heroic rank, not because

Coventry Patmore

they are, except in the moment of love's revelation, outstanding personages, but because no adventure, no trials, no endurances, no achievements are comparable in suggestiveness to theirs. It was left to Christianity to make a hero of a village carpenter, to make a sacred symbol of a gibbet, and to see in the despised and rejected the figure of the Messiah. Consequently, the Eros of Christianity is not a God whose visits end with the dawn, and the place which he delights to honour is not merely a maiden's bed by moonlight, but the little circle of the home. The holy family is a Christian discovery, and consequently its praises have been reserved for a Christian poet. It is an epic subject because, like the grain of mustard seed, its beginnings are as simple as that of life itself, and for this reason, being indeed the foundation of society, its applications and corollaries fill the world as the leaves in the summer, and the fowls of the air, great and high-soaring thoughts, lodge of their natural right among its branches. If the significance of the subject is thus justified, what, we must ask, is the mark of an epic poet? It is surely a simplicity of acceptance, like that of the ocean, into which are emptied all the rivers of the earth. Not for nothing did the Greek tragedian speak of the "innumerable laughter of the sea," not for nothing was the laugh of Shakespeare said to be "broad as ten thousand beeves at pasture." The great stream of human affairs, men's habit of life, their wars, their loves, the gods they worship, the houses which they inhabit, the pilgrimages on which they go—these fall into the epic as gold into the mould. But there must be some focus for the interest. Homer found it in the siege of Troy, Dante in a visit to the other world; Chaucer in a pilgrimage; Milton in Chaos, and it was Milton alone who seemed to be writing of the past. Each of the others is describing a contemporary habit of life. These themes, however, are but the felloes of the wheel. Its sleeping centre, the hub of existence, is the family. On that Patmore fixed his gaze; there and there only was the

Coventry Patmore

secret centre of human life. He would be content with no subject less simple, and consequently less profound, than married love, for love as he used it, was a term of precision.

Note, too, that it is normally the glory of an epic poet to arrive at the end of a great tradition, to be the summit of an old civilization, and to stand therefore at the crest of its abyss ; not, like Milton, to be born out of due time in the throes of the overthrow of an epoch. The accident of this fate was Milton's, and because Milton seems to us the last of epic poets, his practice has seemed to set the seal on that which is really the exception. Before *Paradise Lost* was written (he began it at the age of fifty), Milton had grafted himself on to the Greek vine. In adopting an earlier mythology, he adulterated, but without discarding, his own faith ; and consequently the epic itself rings the song of his confusion. Its very subject is chaos ; its hero the prince of rebels ; our sympathies are with the villain, though never honestly and overtly so. For the art of Milton and the mind of Milton were at odds : that is why chaos inspired him. It was the best that such a centaur, a Pagan who was also a Puritan, could do. Milton was a man with divided loves, and divided allegiance. His poem is the epic of division. Therefore, though it adopts the structure of an epic, its idea is tainted with something of the temper of a nonconformist tract. It has achieved its ghastly work of giving to the Devil all the best tunes. Its effect has been to fasten the detestable Puritan Deity upon us, but the truth is that rebellion is a minor theme. Affirmation is the health of life. To overthrow the misconception of epic, to which Milton's art betrayed the Muse, was the task of Coventry Patmore, and unlike Milton, he is a superb example of freedom from the tyranny of contemporary ideas. Only that freedom can give the temper of an epic, for that temper is normally the expression of a grave serenity of soul. Dante was a poet of tradition. So was Chaucer, so was Homer. Milton's mind was as turbid as the point where rivers

Coventry Patmore

meet. Patmore recovered the epic tradition that for the time had perished from the world. His object was :

To speak but of forgotten things.

To far-off times to come.

Health has no symptoms. We still wait a definition of sanity ; and most poets, like most doctors, busy themselves less with the normal than with the diseased. This is why simplicity has had no song, natural love no portrayer, the health of the affections no significance in epic art. That is why Patmore is neglected, while Ibsen is praised, and why Shelley's description of marriage in the *Epipsychidion* is quoted and remembered, while Patmore's in *The Angel* is forgotten or despised ; for the simplest themes require the rarest perceptive power, which perhaps explains why the body of religious poetry is so small. The only gift for which he asked was

The power of saying things

Too simple and too sweet for words.

His prayer was granted. Indeed, to conceive such a prayer is to have earned its answer ; and his latest verse has the following proud close :

Humility and greatness grace the task

Which he who does it deems impossible.

It was the earlier prayer which accompanied Patmore's meditation upon love, which every myth and religion has seen to be the primary simplicity. And when he asked himself where he should go to illustrate his theme, he saw that a pair of modern lovers alone would provide him with the answer. He went for love's secret to its source. In remembering that all mythologies and religions have found in love the source of all their hopes, and the summit of human aspiration, he observed also that love in its nature is the same in all epochs, and that the way of a man with a maid is so fundamental a fact that love has dignified its own trappings in every phase of life and civilization : the cock with his plumage, the hen with her nest, the bed of King Solomon, the couch of Psyche,

Coventry Patmore

the rags of the beggar maid, the dress of Guinevere, the armour of Arthur, the cowl of Abelard, the courts of Provence, the trunk hose of Romeo, the ruff of Queen Mary, the complexion of Mary Fitton, the frocks of Lady Hamilton, Nelson's uniform: these details are sacred to poets and to posterity because Love once wore them at history's fancy dress ball. Why then, Patmore was simple enough to ask, should not the dress, the manner, the polite life of his own age be equally admissible in art? They are so to the painter and to the dramatist, why not also to the poet? If we linger with delight over the design on the shield of Achilles and with Nausicaa and her girls take the washing to the shore, why should not love find in Salisbury Close a fair setting, and in the manners and dresses of its inhabitants a fit *décor* for epic verse? There is no reason, and yet a distinguished critic, whom I am too considerate to name, has dismissed this atmosphere from poetry on the ground that it is concerned with "the accidents of civilization, the absurd and comfortable prose of middle-class felicity." But must there not be something lacking in the sincerity of a critic who declares unworthy of the Muse the kind of house which he and every cultivated person wishes to inhabit, the kind of manners which he most desires in his own friends and family, the whole world of detail in fact which it has been the aim (and reward) of his own success to achieve? To accept this absurd view is to make the separation of art from life complete, and the only effect of that is to degrade the one and to make us recoil with loathing from the other. To recognize to what a world is reduced from which art is excluded we do not have to look far. It has been the pride of an age of progress, the achievement of the Nineteenth Century, to create that world. Art driven from her home, which is the streets of a city, wherever men gather together in fact, has therefore been perversely wooed. She has been sought and welcomed as an "escape from life." In consequence, art has caught the same infection. We live in an age when art is prized as an escape from

Coventry Patmore

actuality. The gulf between the "real" and the "ideal"; "truth" and "commonsense," "honour" and "business," "love" and "duty," "respectability" and "happiness," "morality" and "inclination," "art" and "use," is now complete. And in this world from which art is banished, money and cheapness are our gods, just as in this art from which actuality is an outcast you will naturally prefer the complex to the simple, the fantastic to the sincere, the fescennine to the fantastic, the feverish to the serene, the corrupt to the healthy, the diseased to the pure. In fine, by endorsing the separation of art from life, you will sanction the modern world as we know it, modern art as we mostly find it; and if *that* does not content you, you could hardly be happier in hell.

Thus *The Angel* is a test case. If you recoil from its realism, if you dislike its verisimilitude, if you hate to be reminded of the pleasant places wherein of choice your own life is cast, you are committed to the view that poetry and modern life are mutually exclusive, and that which is false of every other age is true of our own. Coventry Patmore's genius lay in his native immunity to so monstrous a suggestion, and even the critics themselves in praising his "chill, ecstatic prose," have admitted him to be "a great thinker on the principles of art." Since they also admit him to be a poet even in *The Angel*, he has forced them to condemn themselves. His detail will be prized when it is no longer credible, though his achievement may not be recognized till London is as strange as Tyre. Enough then to remember that, in the sections of his narrative, he deliberately put into poetry all those things which other poets have been careful to exclude. There is a magnificent rhapsody on clothes; the port passes after dinner; the marriage settlement is discussed in detail; the heroine draws off her gloves as she enters the church; the finest thoughts are given from a Cathedral pulpit by a Dean; the piano plays in the drawing room; men smoke after dinner; and the dinner bell recurrently announces the delightful

Coventry Patmore

regularity of the meals. The husband's dismay at the sight of his first-born is duly noted ; and the present of a pair of socks to the baby is recorded in its natural place. Since the whole attraction of the scene and subject is to lie in their familiarity, since the whole story depends entirely for its interest upon the subtlety of thought which is lavished on the course of a typical, that is to say an ordinary, courtship, it is the whole point of the incidents themselves to be as commonplace as possible. Their whole charm is to lie in their familiarity, and he was anxious to relate the exquisite reflections in his Preludes to the thread of a familiar story, on which they hang as pearls upon a string. Married love, and not merely the dawn of desire, is the theme in its entirety, and for this reason domesticities are introduced. For domesticity is as much the atmosphere of married love as the moonlight and the balcony are that of courtship. But the complete theme is wholly new to epic poetry. No great poet had ever made it a central theme before.

Though we leave *The Angel* only at our peril, for the roots of his poetry and philosophy are there, the theme had for Patmore a significance beyond itself. He noted that love, like the world, promises more than it performs : that there is a sigh as of keening in its ecstasy. Natural love, therefore, he inferred to be the precursory revelation and rehearsal of that infatuation which God showers upon the soul, and the nature of this Divine courtship could, he said, be apprehended only by the study of its antitype in nature. The Odes therefore provide the transcendental philosophy, which is built upon the data of experience, and these data it is the delight of *The Angel* to provide. The complete Patmorean philosophy is grounded in the home and on the family, to rise, because its roots are secure, to heights of mystical communion, for which every experience, in the course of a human love affair, has been rehearsed. Patmore therefore believed that nuptial love was the ever-renewed myth open to all eyes in which all the secrets of religion, of art, of society were reflected, by reference to which they

Coventry Patmore

were to be apprehended, and in terms of which alone they could be approached with any chance of fruitful study. This idea that human love is a parable, is staggering in its simplicity, and inattentive people cannot be persuaded to recognize it to be an idea at all. How universal were its corollaries can be judged from Patmore's axiom

In the arithmetic of life
The smallest unit is a pair.

It has led to the creation of a poetry which is married more closely to philosophy and to experience than any other, and in *The Unknown Eros* it rises to heights of contemplation that only the myths themselves have reached. Incidentally it has achieved the enormous feat of showing that all that Baudelaire, Byron or Shelley could say of love outside the circle of the marriage ring, can be said with equal subtlety within it ; that obedience to law can be as beautiful as rebellion ; that virtue is delightful and not dull ; and that sin has no prerogative of attractiveness. The originality of this achievement has largely gone unrecognized because the world lives under the tyranny of the superstition that the Devil has all the best tunes. Patmore proved that that is not so, but at the cost of depriving sinners of their self-respect. It is his achievement in *The Angel* to have set traditional, that is to say respectable, ideas to poetry, that virtue may no longer be ashamed, for he believed in virtue and wisdom with sufficient sincerity to delight in them for their own sake, and this is the justification of them which he offers to the world :

Would Wisdom for herself be woo'd,
And wake the foolish from his dream,
She must be glad as well as good,
And must not only be but seem.
Beauty and joy are hers by right ;
And knowing this, I wonder less
That she's so scorned, when falsely dight
In misery and ugliness.

Coventry Patmore

A right life is known by its gladness. If we measure the poets by the degree of their gaiety, we shall know how to place them, and shall recognize even in the smile of Silenus a quality the absence of which is horrible on the faces of many estimable men.

To Patmore chastity was not a negative condition, but the very altitude of married love, and he saw that the difference between vice and virtue was merely the difference between the disorder and the order of the same energy. Of the body he said that it was

So rich with wealth concealed
That heaven and hell fight chiefly for this field.

And again his essay on *The Point of Rest in Art* brings criticism back to a physical illustration which has the authority of a self-evident fact.

The Puritanic blight of the Reformation has now infected the whole of life, and we have authority for stating that members of the Church herself have not escaped contagion. A Puritan can be defined as a person to whom all things are impure; just as a Pagan was a person who was as free from purity or impurity as an animal. Silenus is comparatively healthy, for he is a savage; Pan is healthy, for he is the animal passion of life. Both, in whatever superfluity of naughtiness they may and do indulge, are at least Christian in this, that they are not Protestants: they accept and indulge their own nature and do not start with a denial. Man to the Puritan is a child of wrath. Man to the Pagan is a child of Nature. Man to the Christian is a child of God. It will be objected, perhaps, that the doctrine of original sin is a Christian, not a Puritan one. The answer is that that doctrine is to the Christian a source of comfort and delight, as it is to the Puritan a nightmare of terror. This difference in their attitude is capital. It explains the gaiety of the Christian spirit; it justifies the sunniness of the Saints. It explains why the Church is a Mother to her children, who, instead of terrifying them with punishments, opens her arms to offer to them the caresses

Coventry Patmore

of penance and repentance, because its divine birthright is the hereditary honour of the soul, to which, for its proving, original sin is, by comparison, but the bad fairy-godmother. For this reason, in a Puritan world, the only poet whose poetry is really steeped in sex, who sings no other song, who has no other image, is regarded as a prude! For he alone can accept it in simplicity. The world has now gone mad on the subject of sex, for sex must drive anyone mad who approaches it as a Puritan. The Pagans built their myths upon it, the very savage his superstitions. It has been left to the Puritan to accuse the Creator of indecency. Therefore it is delightful to find that one poet who had no other thought, no other study, no other pre-occupation, no other joy but the body, is Coventry Patmore, and because he had the joy, and not the lack of it, the joyless word sex is never mentioned in his works. Only a poet to whom the Incarnation is more than a dogma and has become incorporated into the living tissue of his own mind can write profoundly of love or the body without using the word sex at all. Nor, for those with eyes to see, is Patmore's knowledge less detailed than that of those who have devoted their lives to its study. There is implicit in such an ode as that to *Pain* a world of knowledge and experience. It flashes its profound glance into the recesses of the nerves.

The intellect of Coventry Patmore is the greatest philosophic intellect that has expressed itself in English verse. There is more pressure to the square inch in him than in any other poet. He has the final flavour of a great style, the note of authority. The masculine intellect always controls the sensitive emotion. Simplicity, not luxuriance, is his character. Affirmation, not rebellion, is his note. The latter gave to him the extraordinary power of showing the beauty even of those minor virtues which are supposed to be irremediably dull. One instance must suffice. It is his praise of punctuality. He has made even that seem beautiful, and the feat is accomplished so casually that a single line

Coventry Patmore

suffices. When the clock strikes as a party enters Salisbury Cathedral, he says that they crossed its threshold

As if attended on by Time.

If that line does not contain more scent than a whole garden of words, there is no such thing as the economy of art. For of punctuality, as of all rightly ordered duties, the yoke is easy, the burden light.

To realize this in regard to most duties, to see it clearly in the complex drama of love and marriage, is the reward of a rare sanity. *The Angel* is full of wisdom. For instance, how much lies behind the following couple of lines :

Man must be pleased, but him to please
Is Woman's pleasure.

And who can read that Prelude entitled *The Spirit's Epochs*, without being reminded of those which have been the great moments of his own life ? The Wedding Sermon is the finest epitome of a philosophy of marriage ever done ; and how lightly wisdom dances on the wings of Patmore's verse !

When we come to the lyrical odes of *The Unknown Eros*, and breathe there the thin mountain air, we touch the end of that drama, which as sex to the scientist and passion to the poet, culminates in the ecstasy whereof the great contemplatives have preserved the record. Still in the iambic measure, the odes are written in no logical stanzas, but they have the effect of an inspired improvisation in which the virtuosity of the author's ear is never at fault. The movement rises and falls with the intensity or lapse of emotion, and the relations of Eros and Psyche are seen in the sharp outline which etched the story of their human counterparts. The details are as precise as in the myth preserved by Apuleius, and those who want a commentary upon them may find it in the prose essay *Dieu et ma dame*, where the analogy between the process of divine and of human love is shown to be an identity. In this rarefied and ecstatic poetry the phrases twinkle like stars. Thompson and Crashaw have been more

Coventry Patmore

resplendent, richer in imagery ; but there is an altitude in the Odes which is the very Alpine air. It seems strange to the present writer that the Odes can be praised, unless he who praises them is drawn from the poetry which flowers there to its root in *The Angel*. Everything contained in the Odes is implicit in *The Angel*, and how can the transcendental delights of the soul be enjoyed fully, if the truths of the height are not also to be recognized among the valleys ? The two poems are so knit that they are one, and the philosophy which they illuminate offers to the ordinary man not only a summit to which he can attain, but a starting point with which he is familiar. Frankly, I do not know where else this double satisfaction is to be found. The chain is complete from the home to the heavens ; every link is brought to the test of normal human experience, and in the essays it finds its applications even to the principles of politics and art. *The Angel* has rescued modern life for the epic, and that achievement alone is sufficient to place Patmore among the great poets of the modern world.

OSBERT BURDETT.

BISHOP MCQUAID OF ROCHESTER (1868-1909)

[A foreword as to Bishop McQuaid is perhaps advisable before publishing a sketch of his episcopate from his ultimate biographer. As yet no account has been given of this American Bishop, whose life was one long manglement of strife and progress. It is difficult to print from his letters without asking whether he always meant what he wrote. The answer is that his was a soul to which the least compromise was unknown and all qualification of speech impossible. His struggle with Archbishop Ireland is historic ; but no one misunderstood his retort when asked if he was going to bury the hatchet with Archbishop Ireland : " Yes, in his skull ! " This was shortly before the great antagonists met and shook hands. Perhaps the same reason that prevented Ireland from becoming Cardinal prevented McQuaid from becoming an Archbishop. They were both original pioneers, in every sense of the word original, and they were Irishmen leading the Church in America out of the rut by different ways. Nevertheless, as Mr. Maurice Egan has witnessed, Ireland could have been a Cardinal if he had allowed Roosevelt to accede to Rome's request to make the request from the White House, and McQuaid could have become Archbishop of the bankrupt Cincinnati at a time when characteristically he said that See needed not a financier but a saint. Rome knew that he had a touch of both.

It is perhaps accidental that such men as McQuaid become bishops. Rome slakes originality and tempers strength, only allowing a licence to either in fields otherwise impenetrable to her system. Bishops normally are obedient fly-wheels, not generating motors ; machines of gentle but inflexible calibre, but not unruly machinists. But in face of threatening difficulty and emergency the Church does allow a Hughes or an Ireland or a McQuaid to develop. McQuaid became a bishop two years before

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

the Vatican Council, which he left before signing the Decree. He died ten years ago, leaving America her model Seminary, St. Bernard's, Rochester. His stand for the Catholic School, as representing personal liberty against a fatal centralization, is the stand of the Church to-day. For forty years the Bishop of Rochester was unwavering, even in an age of strong men. It was said that if Ireland broke Corrigan, McQuaid broke Ireland in the sense that within Catholic unity and charity one bishop can oppose and defeat the policy of another.

The Holy Church cannot grow stale or stagnate. Her archbishops are sent as salt, and not as sugar, to the world. For health and growth's sake there must be smart and suffering. Out of the internal conflicts of the American Church grew her external strength. It is impossible not to respect both Ireland and McQuaid and even love Dr. Keane, who, in the episcopal strife, was removed from the head of the Catholic University by the same power which vindicated his orthodoxy by appointing him Archbishop of Dubuque, where he died, a few weeks before Archbishop Ireland, in the odour of sanctity. When John Ireland died, in the Fall of 1918, an era of American Church history closed. His career was unrepeatable, at once a missionary pioneer and the first American prelate to become an international character. While McQuaid's career was intensely localized, Ireland played a temperate Wolsey on a minor scale. Wolsey actually made England a European Power. Archbishop Ireland, though unofficial, was as striking a figure in the days when the United States entered the international arena. In the first place he had largely helped to make McKinley president; and, when the Philippines fell to McKinley's armies, Ireland was influential in salving the Philippine Church. The McKinley-Taft policy to the Church in the islands justified the political action on his part, of which Bishop McQuaid bitterly complained. It was, of course, as a citizen and not as a prelate that he invaded Corrigan's diocese and drew the famous attack of Bishop McQuaid. In his person and times he tried to solve the

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

difficult question exactly where American citizenship and Catholic allegiance touch. He discovered that it was on a broad latitude. Perhaps he wished the Church to become an American institution before the time was fully ripe. He wished German and Irish Catholics to find the Mississippi and the Harlem sweeter waters than the Rhine and Shannon. McQuaid was opposed to the workings of foreign Nationalism for theological reasons, as when they took a secret form ; while Ireland opposed their manifestations for patriotic reasons. But his political Americanism was mistaken for a religious Americanism. Neither was an Irish patriot ; but as Americans they were both intensely and wisely desirous of Irish freedom. Rome gave them liberty and discretion, far more so than if they had been State-appointed or Concordat-chosen. They used their liberty as their human foresight and character urged them, and the Church, which took no responsibility for their disagreements, did not waste their hard-won experiences. Their very roughness smoothed the way of the future American Church. It is true, however, that the Church, by a divine weakness, loves and seeks that peace and immobility which her own teaching tells her is reserved for another world, and she cannot be regardless of an ecclesiastical struggle. She would not go out of her way, or press against various pressures, in order to bestow the emblem of Hierarchical beatitude on Archbishop Ireland or on the subject of McQuaid's championship and zeal. No doubt it added much to the spirituality of the last days of both Ireland and Corrigan to know that they must literally die to the world before Rome could make one of those gestures, sympathetic rather than ironic, as though to say these men were both worthy and fully worthy of our purple, but the circumstances were less favourable than we. Spirituality was deeply inset in the background of their lives, McQuaid's no less than Ireland's ; but the spirit is invisible and eludes the writer, whereas *litera manet !*

When Archbishops Ireland and Corrigan clashed,

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

McQuaid defended the latter from his own Cathedral of Rochester. He had regarded Corrigan as his protégé since, as he revealed at the Month's Mind of him dead, "I assured the bishops that they had little comprehension of the capacity and the learning and the strength of will-power of that mere boy as they regarded him, and upon the pledge of my word *in ten minutes* he was placed first on the list." With McQuaid, like Jellicoe, ten minutes involved some history-making. He never gave up a position unless to outflank another. Perhaps even Rome regarded him with nervous appreciation. When he appeared on the horizon, the Curia knew he would never leave till he had won. In his dealing with Rome he modelled himself on the English Hierarchy. He said himself that every fight left him five years younger. He showed a hard front both to Curia and Curate. With his most brilliant priest, Father Lambert, he refused to be reconciled even when the Apostolic Delegate brought Lambert to his house. Archbishop Satolli had to bow to the Bishop of Rochester when he simply ordered the Archbishop's companion to leave his house. He brooked no rival, and wished to make his priests his vicars, until he went to the other extreme. He was vigorous, many-sided and simple. He grew his own grapes, and he was as disappointed as a child by a poor vintage. He had all the love for business detail that a convert has for the minutiae of ceremony. He knew everything down to the penny, the ounce, and the inch. He said the uses of concrete were discovered by the U.S. Government and the Bishop of Rochester.

He seemed over-strict and intolerant ; but, Roosevelt-like, if he brooked no rival, he was ready for new ideas. He introduced "the devout female sex" into his Seminary, and he added culture to "grind" in the study. He influenced the whole American priesthood. Archbishop Hanna was his type of pupil. The same indomitable will-power caused his last appearance against all advice at the dedication of a new hall in his Seminary. He was wheeled in to address his priests for the last time.

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

Doctor and Last Sacraments were at hand for the inevitable collapse. Fainter grew his voice, and fainter the taps of his stick, until he was unconscious. A little later he was dead. Now he is a legend and a legacy in the Church of America.—S.L.]

AS in England, so in America, the small diocese of Rochester stands out prominently on account of the distinguished character of one of its bishops. Nor is this the only reason for connecting the names of these two widely distant sees. The first bishop of the American Diocese was pleased to unite his own with the English See by choosing for himself its old episcopal arms with a slight modification, namely the change of the pilgrim's shell on the centre of the St. Andrew's Cross to the shamrock. What was more important for the newly created Diocese of Rochester was the fact that Bishop McQuaid showed the same fidelity that Bishop Fisher observed towards the little Diocese of Rochester in England.

Bishop McQuaid refused to change his poor wife of a diocese for the richest widow in America. His opponents little realized how invulnerable he was on this point; consequently they did not hesitate to move heaven and earth to prevent his promotion from Rochester. He had occasion to write of their efforts to Corrigan, then Bishop of Newark:

"Some imagine that I am on the list for New York. Efforts will be made to defeat my *chance*. Just a year ago I was maligned at Rome when it was expected that I might get the appointment to Cincinnati. Then I was attacked on the Infallibility. Two letters from Cardinal Simeoni indicated clearly that my adhesion to the Vatican Council cannot be questioned. Now it so happens that few bishops have published these Decrees, caused them to be read to the people and circulated in pamphlet form. In 1875, in publishing the Jubilee, I issued a letter, and joined on to it these Decrees in full, using Cardinal Manning's translation. My last letter to the Cardinal showed him plainly how I stood,

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

but that I would not submit gracefully to the calling in question of my faith and honour at the instigation of unknown assailants." The Bishop, it is true, held out to the last in his opposition to the definition of Papal Infallibility, not only because he thought the definition inopportune, but also "because somehow or other it was in my head that the bishops ought to be consulted." Although he tried at the Council, with others, not to have episcopal prerogatives sacrificed to Papal prerogative, he emphatically declared to the people in his Cathedral (August 28th, 1870): "I have now no difficulty in accepting the dogma." While Bishop McQuaid had little trouble in exposing this calumny, no man strove harder than he himself to prevent his own promotion to Cincinnati, where the bankruptcy of Archbishop Purcell's brother had involved in financial ruin the Archbishop himself as well as some diocesan churches and institutions. Still suffering from the effects of an attack of typhus fever contracted in Italy, he wrote: "I have no objection to the recovery of my health so long as there is no doubt of Cincinnati." Providence was evidently in favour of Bishop McQuaid's determination to stay in Rochester, as Bishop Gilmour of Cleveland informed the Archbishop of Baltimore (Sept. 29th, 1879): "It seems the former list for the coadjutorship of Cincinnati never reached Rome. So Cardinal Simeoni directed a new list to be sent on, saying Rochester strongly objected to go."

No doubt one of the factors that moved Rome to pick out Bishop McQuaid for the difficult Cincinnati post was the review of his stewardship in the administration of his diocese on the occasion of his first decennial visit *ad limina* in 1878. The most striking feature of his work in this period was his vigorous Catholic-school policy, the need of which he had come to understand early in life. Although Archbishop Hughes of New York and Bishop Bayley of Newark clearly recognized that the school was nearly as necessary to the child as the Church, the agitation of the Catholic-school question was gradually allowed to lapse. On his return from the Vatican

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

Council, Bishop McQuaid not only created schools wherever possible, but he also re-opened the public discussion of Catholic rights in the education of Catholic children. The resuscitation of a seemingly dying issue was not acceptable to all even within the Catholic Church, as he later reminded Bishop Gilmour: "You may remember how pacific and non-offensive ecclesiastics spoke of me when I raked the ashes off the smouldering school question and flamed the embers into a blaze. My own Archbishop (McCloskey) was full of wise caution and Archbishop Bayley was afraid I was going too far." But this did not damp his ardour in the fight for Christian Free Schools. His public lectures, supplemented by communications to the press and to reviews, failed as the efforts of Archbishop Hughes had failed in the 'forties, to obtain an equitable share of the taxes contributed by Catholics as well as by others, but they served to quicken the conscience of his own people to more earnest co-operation to give the Catholic child its birthright—a good Catholic education. One of the great means to this end also gave practical proof that it was possible for the State to control secular education without interference with the religious rights of the parochial school. Bishop McQuaid later took the trouble to explain to Cardinal Ledochowski how this was done through the Regents of the University of the State of New York: "Unless I am mistaken, the State of New York is the only one of the United States which has such a board of Regents in charge of their educational system. They have under their care the colleges, academies, and schools of the State. They in no way interfere in the religious working of our Catholic institutions of learning; only if these wish to put themselves under the University, they can do so, and, complying with certain conditions, can obtain a certificate, a diploma, or a degree in secular studies, the same as the non-Catholic institutions of learning in the State. In the year 1874, the parochial school of the Cathedral of Rochester was the first to take advantage of the Regents' Examination, and win for its

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

pupils the State's certificate. Now, all over the State, Catholic schools and academies in secular studies equal and even surpass the non-Catholic institutions of the same grade. By voluntarily accepting this supervision of the State, which we can do without the sacrifice of any principle, there has been a marvellous improvement in teacher and pupils. There is no place for partiality or favouritism; the question and matter for examination are prepared at the governmental offices in Albany, where the Regents have their bureau of administration, and are sent to all schools and academies that apply for them, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. We receive no money or support from the State, but it is our ambition to show to our own people and to others that our schools are as good and better than the State schools even by their own tests."

With Catholic schools raised to this standard of excellence, Bishop McQuaid felt constrained to "refuse absolution to all parents who send their children to the public schools. Without approving of the High School, I do not refuse absolution to those who send there, as we have no school of corresponding grade." However, at times he was sorely vexed at the diversity of action on the part especially of priests and bishops throughout the country in this matter. Thus he complained to Archbishop Bayley (June 29th, 1874), that "it is not pleasant to be put in the power of the hosts of young fledglings coming over from Rome bursting with conceit, or to be snubbed by laymen." Archbishop Bayley had surprised him with an account of the practice in Rome, which led him to remark: "Rome is always sound in theory, but dreadfully loose in practice, once the difficulties of the theories come home to herself. If it be true that in Rome, where Catholic schools abound, Catholic parents can send their children to State schools such as they now have, I don't see how I can be justified in the course which I now follow." Nevertheless, he was consoled with the news "that the moral duties of priests and parents with regard to Christian education of children are to be defined

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

with some precision, so that we may know exactly what course to follow." When the instruction on Public Schools, issued by the Congregation of the Holy Office for the Bishops of the United States (Nov. 24th, 1875), reached him, he was pleased to find his own Catholic school policy fully maintained. A movement had been brewing in certain circles to obtain from Rome a regulation of the canonical standing of priests, which to Bishop McQuaid seemed to be designed to make "presbyterianism" triumph over episcopalianism to the sacrifice of the spiritual welfare of Catholic congregations. After his arrival in Europe, Bishop McQuaid "met the Bishop of Salford going to Dublin, and had some interesting talks with him," which evidently made him resolve "to get all the information I can on my return, together with all the synods and their method of acting. They save themselves much trouble by appointing their priests as administrators of parishes, having only a few rectories and rectors. We must come to some such arrangement in America." Bishop Corrigan judged this information of sufficient importance to communicate bodily to the Archbishop of Baltimore (Nov. 26th, 1878). He also gave him the results of a rapid perusal of the data on a couple of English dioceses.

Meanwhile malcontents made such headway at Rome that Bishop McQuaid, on finishing his own business there, had to defend the American hierarchy "against the sweeping accusations made against us—especially that our 'arbitrary conduct makes Priests bewail their ordination—anxious to escape the country as from a prison, and makes parents refuse to permit their sons to study for the Priesthood.'" What was worse, Rome was duped into legislating in favour of the malcontents when the matter was narrowed down to the chief issue: "*Must* a Prelate consult the Commission before making *any* transfer of a pastor from Church to Church, against the will of the latter?" When Bishop McQuaid was shown the letter, ready to be mailed, his worst fears were excited lest the new legislation "inflict very great injury

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

on the Church in this country." He did not spare himself to avert the calamity, and fortunately he was able to intervene sufficiently before sickness disabled him from taking further part in the conflict, as he informed Bishop Corrigan from Paris (March 29th, 1879): "My strength is coming back gradually, and I have reason to hope that by the time I reach America I shall be myself again. I had a narrow escape. However, I was compensated for all my sufferings by the success of the great question before the Sacred Congregation. Until I got Cardinal Manning and the English bishops aroused, all seemed lost. Only two or three cardinals of a dozen appeared inclined to take my view of the subject. Bilio was dead against us, and he is a power in the Congregation. My whole cry was for delay until the American bishops could be heard from. On my knees I begged the Holy Father not to permit this question to be settled without consulting the bishops of the United States. He inquired about the matter when I took leave of him, and showed great satisfaction when told that all was according to our wish. I left Rome on March 11th. The day before the Congregation met, and appointed Cardinal Simeoni and two others to draw up the letter of explanation of the *Instructio*." When the *Responsa ad dubia* reached him from Rome, he expressed himself satisfied in writing to Bishop Corrigan (Dec. 2nd, 1879): "The *Instructio* as explained is not the great thing that some disaffected priests looked for. Fixity of tenure and immunity from discipline were what they wanted. Bishops and people were to have no rights as against their claims." Bishop McQuaid was quite sure, "the wisdom of the Holy See guiding us, we shall be able to establish in the country a Canon Law suited to its needs and circumstances. If it must be imputed to me as a sin that I spoke and wrote, when requested, on all subjects bearing on the welfare of the Church in these United States, with the freedom, fulness and plainness of speech becoming an American Bishop, then I acknowledge the sin."

The Bishop confessed to his own priests that his efforts

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

during his stay in Rome were directed to secure two rights for the young and growing Church of his country that concerned "the true interests of priests working on the American missions, their honour and standing." The first was "to place our older-established and well-settled missions on a footing of equality with the parishes of Canon Law in the European countries"; and for this he had suggested the establishment of missionary rectories. The second was "to secure as a right and not as a charity, ample provision for the maintenance of worthy priests, no longer able to toil in the ministry through age or sickness." He took his own clergy into his confidence in these matters, as his work at Rome had been misrepresented by others. He was "pleased to acknowledge the desire shown by the ecclesiastical authorities to obtain full and correct information on all subjects connected with the American Church. They listen readily and take note of all that is said. To say that they are often bewildered by strange and conflicting statements is to put the case very mildly." The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in session (Nov. 9th to Dec. 7th, 1884) manifested great reluctance in the creation of irremovable rectors, but the Bishop of Rochester gave testimony that he had advised the institution of such rectors in place of chapters, when he was last in Rome, and the approved Decrees made imperative the appointment of irremovable rectors within three years. In this matter the bishops seemed especially fearful of results as far as discipline was concerned.

A determined effort was made to escape the necessity of Episcopal Courts for the trial of clerics along the lines prescribed. Some held that the matter had been definitely settled by the Propaganda, but Bishop McQuaid, not without support from others, said that it was their right and duty to point out the difficulties under which the new method laboured, as the guilty would hardly meet with punishment. Finally, the Archbishops of St. Louis, of Boston, and of Petra, the Bishops of Richmond,

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

Rochester, and Trenton, and the Vicar Apostolic of Dakota were appointed humbly to petition the Holy Father to have the old form of trials in clerical cases retained. Rome, however, insisted on the erection of the prescribed Episcopal Courts within three years after the promulgation of the Council, unless a further dispensation was obtained from the Propaganda.

Bishop McQuaid followed with keen interest the conflict between the English Hierarchy and the Regulars, which ended in the settlement of their relations by the Holy See in the Constitution *Romanos Pontifices*. In the negotiations for this he thought the English bishops gave an example worthy of imitation by their American brethren. He pointed out the fact to Bishop Corrigan (November 20th, 1879): "I see that Cardinal Manning and the Bishop of Clifton have returned to Rome. These English bishops give good lessons which we do not learn. They look after their interests in the right place and with due zeal and intelligence. Our faith is in Providence and somebody else. I will send you the case of the Bishops *v.* the Regulars. You can show it to the Cardinal (McCloskey) if you think it worth while. Keep the documents for me. They may be useful one of these days." The legislation of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore on Regulars was based primarily on this constitution. Bishops Dwenger and Moore were finally selected as envoys to present the acts and decrees of the Council to the authorities at Rome and to work for their approval, although there had been some talk of sending Bishops McQuaid and Gilmour. However, Bishop McQuaid wrote to the latter (December 27th, 1884): "I felt quite certain that after my action in the Ancient Order case I would be considered a dangerous man to send to Rome by their Graces of St. Louis, Philadelphia, and Chicago. I think that they and others are a little afraid of me. Perhaps it is just as well for me not to go. But if Archbishop Corrigan and yourself could go, some good would certainly come out of your representations. If we cannot have a strong representation

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

in members of our own body, it would be better to have no one there. It will not answer for anyone to go unless officially. He would be snubbed and sent home. But we can write. I propose to write at length to Cardinal Simeoni after the departure of our envoys." Under considerable pressure Bishop Gilmour was finally also duly accredited, and providentially so. Bishop Dwenger proved hopelessly unfit for the work; Bishop Moore lacked initiative, but ably seconded the efforts of Bishop Gilmour, who saved an important section of the Council's legislation by a direct appeal to the Holy Father.

Irish agitation in America in some of its phases seemed to Bishop McQuaid the entering wedge of secret societies into the body Catholic of the United States. Thus he suspected that the mission of Parnell and Dillon to America was not as innocent as it appeared, and he made known his suspicions to Bishop Corrigan (February 3rd, 1880): "It will surprise me to learn that Parnell is not working designedly in the interest of the worst section of the *Fenian* party. I am convinced that he is in direct co-operation with Stephens, the head centre of Fenianism with headquarters in Paris, and its chief centre in America in *The Irish World* office. This Society is in full swing in Ireland, but only the leaders are oath-bound and within the inner circle. This Stephens keeps in the dark, but works perseveringly like Mazzini and all of that stripe. As they know that secret societies oath-bound will not take with our people, they restrict membership to those who have no fear of God, and keep the good people in the dark as to their methods and plans. I have written to bishops in Ireland to find out, if possible, the standing of Parnell and the meaning of the National Land League. I believe that it is manipulated by the Fenian leaders." When Bishop McQuaid received word from Ireland, he found himself confirmed in his opposition to Parnell and Dillon. Archbishop McHale wrote: "I must confess that I do not much admire the gentlemen you speak of. Their principles are, to say the least of

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

them, exceedingly dangerous. I think your Lordship's appreciation of them is quite correct." On the receipt of this letter, Bishop McQuaid remarked to Bishop Corrigan (March 22nd, 1880): "Before long we shall see the bishops of Ireland in open antagonism to the Land League because it is only a machine in the hands of the condemned Fenian Society. The policy of caution and a wise holding aloof is the right one for us." Yet, not to allow anyone to place him in an anti-Irish position, he was careful to protest that he yielded to no one in his love "for government of the people by the people, in consonance with that higher law that comes to us by nature and by revelation. It is the form of government towards which the Irish people are surely approximating by methods that cannot be disapproved of, and from which they can be held back only by the rashness and madness of injudicious friends. Persistent agitation on the part of the whole people, avoiding bloodshed and secret societies, upheld by the generous co-operation of American citizens, of whom nothing is asked inconsistent with the loyalty and fealty they owe their own government, will effect radical changes by which the administration of local Irish affairs and interests will be placed where it belongs, in the hands of the people."

Under the circumstances, Bishop McQuaid judged most inopportune the mission with which rumour credited Cardinal Howard's coming to America as papal agent. "Personally, Cardinal Howard would be more acceptable to me than any other member of the Sacred College," Bishop McQuaid declared on hearing the news from Bishop Gilmour. "He is a gentleman, and would do no eaves-dropping work, nor would he have a kitchen cabinet. Yet his appointment to the United States would be unfortunate, as it would stir up the ire of our Celtic friends to a degree Rome has no conception of." When the news proved false, Bishop McQuaid was "inclined to believe that Persico will be here again as delegate. He would do well until he fled from the field of battle with a broken heart. He has a very large and

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

open ear, and loves gossip. It will be very perilous to send us an Italian now, as our Celtic friends are disposed to cry down an Italian Church and rule. The political phase of our trouble will have to be met in the course of the next year." Bishop McQuaid thought he was the right solution to the problem, but "any interference on our part would be regarded as meddlesome impertinence. This condition of affairs will continue until metropolitans hold stated meetings, as in England and Ireland, for private consultation as a means to uniformity of action. At present the rule seems to be, every man for himself and the devil catch the hindmost. So we have diversity of action, conflicting opinions, weak and uncertain legislation, and discipline consequently going to the dogs by default. Rome would not send an agent here if metropolitans protested against it."

Local developments in the summer of 1883 emphasized the need of decisive action. The history of the affair is this, according to a statement by Bishop McQuaid: "At the time O'Donnell assassinated Carey, the informer against the assassins of Burke and Cavendish in Phoenix Park, Dublin, a Catholic newspaper, published in Buffalo by a Catholic priest, contained an article apparently applauding and condoning the crime of O'Donnell. This was the sense put upon the article by all who read it. So much so, that a Protestant secular newspaper published in Rochester quoted the article in part and remarked that this was a strange doctrine to be enunciated by an organ of the Catholic Church. Much excitement was created by these utterances. I then addressed a communication to this newspaper over the signature of 'A Catholic,' repudiating these sentiments and denying that this Catholic newspaper was an organ of the Catholic Church, but rather that it was the organ of its editor and of his readers who encouraged him." Unfortunately, one of his own priests, Father Lambert, used his talent of controversy in the defence of the newspaper, ending with a letter that was refused publication on the ground of its vileness and of the high position of "A Catholic" whom

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

it vituperated. The language used would have been impossible if Bishop McQuaid had signed his articles with his own name. However, by the time the letter was written, Bishop McQuaid had good reason to suspect that Father Lambert knew the identity of "A Catholic." Besides Bishop McQuaid had cause enough to write anonymously. He had to criticize a newspaper of the Buffalo Diocese generally approved by Bishop Ryan, whose relations with Bishop McQuaid had already become strained. Thus the Irish issue was ever a factor of discord also in America.

Bishop McQuaid's main difficulty, Father Lambert, was a man who had put not only Catholics, but also all positively believing Protestants, deeply in debt to himself by his famous *Notes on Ingersoll*. Other writings and editorial labours had given Father Lambert a prominent literary standing before the American public. In Rochester, however, since Bishop McQuaid's return from Rome in 1879, Father Lambert had become an active factor in fostering trouble for the head of the diocese, sometimes openly, but more often secretly. His conduct finally moved Bishop McQuaid to confine his faculties to the narrow limits of his own parish and to interdict his presence at any other forty hours' devotion than his own. Propaganda, to which Father Lambert appealed after failing to obtain a decision in his favour from the Archbishop of New York, upheld the action of Bishop McQuaid, who informed Bishop Gilmour (December 17th, 1884), that Rome substantially decided: "The Bishop is not obliged to grant faculties to a priest for the whole diocese; and can consequently limit them to a particular mission." Father Lambert did not address any other complaint to Rome till March 20th, 1888. The Prefect of Propaganda, Cardinal Simeoni, naturally communicated then with Bishop McQuaid, who put down his own demands in the case (May 16th, 1888):

1. Rev. Mr. Lambert must apologize to the Vicar-General of the diocese and to the former Rector of the Cathedral for the insults offered them in his newspaper. 2. He must acknowledge

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

before the priests of the diocese that he did not know that I was the writer of the articles signed "A Catholic," and consequently that he did not intend to designate me as a *Tartuffe, an immoral hypocrite*. 3. A transfer to another mission is demanded in behalf of the temporal and spiritual interests of his present charge. 4. A check upon his disposition to form parties and create factions in the diocese is necessary. 5. In view of the fact that Rev. Mr. Lambert was never properly released from Alton, the diocese of his ordination, it would be better for him to go back to it, or, if this arrangement cannot be made, let him go to some other diocese for whose Bishop he may be able to have more respect than he has for the Bishop of Rochester.

When Father Lambert was dismissed from the diocese of Rochester, he took his case personally to Rome at the same time that Bishop McQuaid went there for his second decennial visit *ad limina*. Propaganda had to admit a legal mistake in applying to Father Lambert's case a law which had been passed years after his ordination. This was fine news for Lambert's friends, who used it to the utmost in their campaign to arouse opposition to Bishop McQuaid. The latter bitterly noted the condition of affairs in his letter from Rome to Bishop Gilmour (April 10th, 1889): "Here I am like a culprit snarled at by all the cheap Catholic newspapers of America from the Atlantic to the Pacific." Nevertheless, the Bishop had a strong case against the priest who failed to obtain the coveted order from Rome for his reinstatement in his old parish of Waterloo, and was besides obliged to make an act of submission in the following terms: "Hereby I retract fully and without any reserve whatever I have written directly or indirectly against the said Right Reverend Bishop, and hereby I desire to repair the scandal of the said writings in this my act of retraction." Despite all this, Father Lambert still showed fight on his return to the Rochester Diocese, so that Bishop McQuaid wrote to Bishop Gilmour (November 5th, 1889): "Mr. Lambert declines to accept either of the missions I offer him as beneath his dignity, being inferior to Waterloo. Yet each has a larger pew rental

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

than Waterloo. So for all his insults, calumnies, and outrages, he is to be rewarded. I will not budge from the position I have taken. It is probable then that they will send him back to Waterloo, which act on their part will be equivalent to my removal from the episcopate. I am determined not to accommodate them by handing in my resignation. Propaganda has written to Archbishop Corrigan, but not to me. Yet Lambert and his friends are filling the air with rumours of all kinds. Burtzell came to Waterloo to plot with Protestants and a few bad Catholics Lambert's return. I have grown indifferent as to the result. If other bishops think that Lambert's success will strengthen their hands and maintain discipline, let them look to it. . . . I do not care to meet American bishops. You know the kind of left-handed sympathy I got from them when I dared denounce that infamous Chicago Convention, whose rotten fruits now strew the ground. Some things sicken my soul."

Things were not really as black as they looked at this time. Bishop Gilmour advised him to "attend all meetings of your Episcopal brethren when business and discretion direct such attendance. To stay away is to admit defeat. Let them return Lambert to Waterloo, but in face of your protest; and force them to remove your appointee. Then in time deal with Waterloo as you would with any other place in your diocese. Die before you resign. In the above you have my position. As for our confreres—well, 'every one for himself' is the motto. They whine when evil comes. When you and I spoke of the Clan-na-gael, it was popular to run with the mob. Now the mob has run them into the ground. So it goes." Matters did not get to the extremity feared by Bishop McQuaid, who hastened to write Bishop Gilmour on receipt of word from Rome (January 22nd, 1890): "Yesterday I received Propaganda's last final decision. It confirms that of last July, decides that Lambert shall not go back to Waterloo; that his act of submission shall be published, and that he shall accept one of the two missions I offered him." Bishop McQuaid

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

preferred "not to give newspaper publicity to this last letter *in re* Lambert, wishing to see how the others will act after so many loud announcements of Lambert's return to Waterloo, and the defeat of the fighting Bishop."

No decisive action had been taken as yet in regard to the Irish secret society issue, although Archbishop Corrigan, with the help of Bishops McQuaid and Gilmour, had tried to draw a clear line of cleavage between the good and bad sections of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. Nevertheless, the issue still remained buried in the Committee of Archbishops as far as the country at large was concerned, as the Baltimore Council had been engineered to entrust to them as a body all action on secret societies on the pretext of obtaining uniformity of discipline throughout the United States. Thus Bishop McQuaid came to consider the archbishops as a source of great danger to the Catholic Church of the United States because of usurped authority "in their private *conciliabula*," as he termed their meetings. More than once did he denounce their conduct in his correspondence; and finally he tried to force the issue through the press by seizing an opportunity presented in an interview with Mr. Lahiffe of the New York *World*, of which he wrote (June 24th, 1892): "I talked pretty freely to him, as you will read in the *World* of Saturday. Some evils are growing which no one seems to have the will to check. Among them are these: The assumption of the archbishops to legislate without equality of voice and vote on the part of the bishops. The neglect of the archbishops to act in the matter of secret societies upon full and adequate study. They are not miraculously gifted with inspiration. Their attempts to ignore the Baltimore Council on Secret and *forbidden* Societies. The utterance of extremely liberal and dangerous doctrines by members of the episcopate for the sake of public and popular applause."

Bishop McQuaid's hopes for a settlement of the question were again doomed to disappointment. This led him to remark (December 13th, 1892): "If the

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

archbishops of to-day are going to unsettle the legislation of their predecessors, as seems to be the case, I don't know what an old fogey like me will have to do except to die." He did not feel like putting his conscience in their keeping "when I know beyond a doubt that a certain society is more than dangerous to faith and morals. . . . A society may be harmless in St. Paul, according to their theories, and very dangerous in Rochester." The archbishops' failure to settle the pressing question the following year made Bishop McQuaid fear the worst: "Unless the Lord comes to the help of the Church in America I do not know what is to be its future. We shall fall lower than the Italian laity, judging by the specimens coming to this country." For the same reason he resented the sending of the report of the archbishops' meeting in 1894, plainly declaring (November 7th, 1894): "We are not interested in the doings of the archbishops at their annual meetings outside the question of secret societies. As the question did not come up, the sending of a report to us was labour lost. It is about time for us bishops to begin to hold annual meetings and have a banquet." While the American archbishops refused to act in the question of secret societies, the Holy See itself finally intervened to the great satisfaction of Bishop McQuaid, to which he gave expression in his letter to Archbishop Corrigan (December 12th, 1894): "I am much pleased with the decision of the Holy See in relation to the condemnation of the secret societies, viz., Odd Fellows, Knights of Pythias, and Sons of Temperance. There will be no difficulty in the diocese of Rochester about the enforcement of this decision. The decrees of the Baltimore Council covered these cases very clearly, and it was held almost universally by our people that the Church did not approve of them until after the meeting of the archbishops in Boston, when Archbishop Ireland gave out that these societies were no longer under the ban of the Church. Whereupon many Catholics, in the Western dioceses chiefly, joined them. As I did not consider that Archbishop Ireland

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

had powers to nullify the Baltimore Council and the rule maintained by the American bishops for so many years, I paid no attention to his *ipse dixit*, and observed the old discipline, to which the Holy See now imparts its sanction."

However, when he had strong convictions at variance with Roman plans of action, he did not hesitate to make them known with all possible emphasis till the matter was authoritatively settled. A case in question was the establishment of an Apostolic Delegation at Washington. The question became vital again after the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, over which the Archbishop of Baltimore presided as Apostolic Delegate. Bishop Dwenger was then mentioned as a candidate. Bishop McQuaid "did not at first intend to do aught. I was simply disgusted with the whole affair. . . . However, for the honour of the Holy See I did write a letter to Rome which may serve to open people's eyes with regard to the fitness of the candidate." When Bishop Dwenger's candidacy was set aside, the names of the Ordinaries of Rochester, Boston, and New York were mentioned for the position by Bishop Gilmour, to whom Bishop McQuaid replied: "There is less chance of my appointment [than Dwenger's] so I do not worry. I am too pleasantly situated where I am to covet any other position or more responsibility. Still, I thank you for your good opinion of my humble self. Boston or New York would be the right man." However, news from Rome made the appointment of an American unlikely, and Bishop McQuaid was led to conclude that a branch of Propaganda would be established in the United States with an Italian at its head. "They want to see with their own eyes; so they say." This was written early in 1887, but nothing was done till the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America, which Leo XIII made the occasion for establishing a closer union between the American Church and the centre of Apostolic Truth. January 21st, 1893, he sent word to the American Hierarchy of the appointment of Archbishop Satolli as Apostolic Delegate in the United States. The Holy

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

Father expected the bishops of the country to receive with pleasure what he provided for the greater utility of the Church. There was need of a lot of optimism in view of the crisis Archbishop Satolli had precipitated the previous autumn in the Catholic school question. When Bishop McCloskey of Louisville read the text of his communication to the archbishops of the United States, he honestly confessed to Archbishop Corrigan (December 8th, 1892): "I fear that, if authoritative, it is the death blow to a certain extent of our Catholic schools." Bishop McQuaid expressed the same conviction in writing to the same prelate (December 13th, 1892): "We are all in a nice pickle. Just as our arduous work of the last forty years was beginning to bear ample fruit, they arbitrarily upset the whole. If an enemy had done this! Yesterday an English translation of Mgr. Satolli's address to the archbishops came to hand. Apparently it was sent from Philadelphia—from a priest who has differed with me on the school question. It is only a question of time when, present Roman legislation having wrought incalculable mischief, we, school-children of the Hierarchy, will again receive a lesson in our Catechism from another Italian sent out to enlighten us. The lessons of Satolli's pamphlet (private and confidential) do not apply to the diocese of Rochester where the parochial schools are not only equal, but much superior, to the public schools."

Then Professor Bouquillon, of the Catholic University, under these circumstances, published a pamphlet with the title: *Education, to whom does it belong?* According to his Preface he wrote it "at the request of ecclesiastical superiors. They deemed that a clear exposition of the principles underlying the school question would be both useful and opportune at this hour, when the practical difficulties in which it is involved have become national concerns." If there was any doubt who these superiors were, Bishop Chatard was at least "informed in two interviews—one in St. Louis with the Rt. Reverend Rector of the Catholic University [Keane], and the other in New York with the Most Reverend Archbishop of

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

St. Paul—that the views of Professor Bouquillon are in agreement with their own.” These views are briefly summarized in the concluding paragraph of the pamphlet where education is said to belong “to the individual, physical or moral, to the family, to the State, to the Church; to none of these solely and exclusively, but to all four combined in harmonious working, for the reason that man is not an isolated but a social being.” At once the main issue of the controversy came to be State control of education, which was advocated in such a way by Professor Bouquillon’s pamphlet that it was repeatedly cited in a case before the Courts of Ohio against a Catholic parish priest, who wished to protect his school, entirely supported by private means, against the arbitrary and unwarranted interference of State officers. When the archbishops met in New York (November 17th, 1892), Mgr. Satolli was also in attendance, as he had been sent to the States not only to represent the Holy Father at the Chicago World’s Fair and to take steps for the establishment of a permanent Apostolic Delegation at Washington, but especially to make every effort to eradicate all germs of disagreement from the controversies on the right training of Catholic youth. Having drawn up fourteen propositions for this purpose, Archbishop Satolli presented them to the consideration of the American archbishops in their meeting, where “the difficulties were answered and the requisite alterations made.”

Although this last statement is printed at the foot of the text of the Fourteen Propositions, and was later reiterated by Leo XIII, on the strength of the Minutes of the meeting, in his letter to the American Hierarchy (May 31st, 1893), Bishop McQuaid wrote early in the same year: “Should the other fact become public that N.N. represented to the delegate that his propositions would be signed by the archbishops when it was well known that their signatures would not be given, there would be evidence, if not of conspiracy, then of clear deception.” Then, again, while the Holy Father complained in the same letter of the inopportune publication

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

of the Propositions as the occasion that renewed a hot controversy, Bishop McQuaid asserted that "there could be no excuse for holding back the result of the archbishops' meeting on the two important points of schools and the permanent delegate." Leo XIII freely admitted that bishops of the United States made known to him their anxiety either because of the interpretation placed on some of these Propositions or because of the consequences that might arise therefrom to the loss of souls. He therefore asked each bishop of the country to make known most freely his judgment of the matter in a private letter addressed to himself. Some wrote that they found no cause for fear in the Propositions, but others denounced them as a partial abrogation of the school-law promulgated by the Baltimore Councils, and consequently feared the rise of regrettable disagreements through various interpretations of the Propositions to the detriment of the Catholic schools. Bishop McQuaid belonged to the second group, and eagerly seized the chance to give a "full and clear" criticism of the Propositions: "If all do the same, the Holy Father will know something about the question. Prayers must be telling. All will come right yet. They will not be in good humour in Rome when they learn how they have been deceived." Leo XIII thereupon asked the Hierarchy of the United States to interpret the Apostolic Delegates' Fourteen Propositions in agreement with the said school-law of the Church and faithfully to observe it, not forgetting, however, the fact that there were cases according to the same law when it may be permissible to attend the public school.

While controversies ceased on this score, another conflict was opened with Bishop McQuaid's candidacy for nomination as Regent of the University of the State of New York. A vacancy had been caused in the Board of Regents by the death of Bishop McNeirney of Albany, and nearly all the Catholic prelates of the State chose Bishop McQuaid for the place. Nevertheless the post was given to a Brooklyn priest, the Reverend Sylvester

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

Malone. Bishop McQuaid had considerable knowledge of the persons responsible for this, and referred to their doings in writing to Archbishop Corrigan (March 31st, 1894): "It is all-important to find out all about the outside clerical meddlers in the affairs of this State. Archbishop Ireland is one, but there are others. I shall not be surprised to learn that among them are some of the University professors. . . . While we were thinking only of the leaders among the Republicans, the others were busy getting pledges for Malone and Lambert among the county members. The latter was playing into the hands of the former—anything to beat McQuaid. The defeat did not disappoint me, I expected it. I was sorry for your sake, and much more sorry for the honour of the Church. Bishop Ryan may say what he pleases. He never does anything directly. It is always through others. The Bishop knew what was going on, and permitted, just as he permitted and permits the attacks on me. He always plays the innocent." The crisis came with the election itself in the fall of the year. Archbishop Ireland's policy became so marked in New York city that its Metropolitan could not refrain from addressing privately a protest to another dignitary of the Church (November 15th, 1894): "Our Catholic population is indignant at the procedure of the Archbishop of St. Paul, who, they say, was imported by the Republican party to aid them during the recent elections. Even Bishop Potter (Protestant) inquired of me recently if it were not quite contrary to ecclesiastical decorum for a bishop to deliver a *pronunciamento* to those who were not his subjects, while he himself was in the diocese of a brother bishop? If such a state of things continues, what is to become of diocesan jurisdiction? Fancy my going to St. Paul, staying there three weeks at the Ryan House, staying three weeks without calling on the Archbishop, then parading myself at political meetings, and giving Archbishop Ireland's subjects pointed advice on the way they ought to vote." Archbishop Ireland seemed to be especially unfortunate in the time he chose

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

for intervening in New York State politics. In 1894 more than the ordinary election took place. There was also a vote taken on the Constitution of the State that a Constitutional Convention had just revised. Article IX, section 4, forbade the giving of public money to Church schools of every kind. This was written into the State Constitution in a convention where a Republican majority was the controlling factor. It was strongly opposed by the bishops of the State, who "judged it wiser not to take public action . . . but when questioned privately," did not hesitate to make known their opposition. They trusted "to the intelligence and honesty of the people to defeat this iniquitous measure." It was under these circumstances that Archbishop Ireland personally intervened in favour of the Republican party in the State of New York. The Republicans were victorious at the polls, where the revised Constitution was also voted to be the law of the State for at least twenty years or longer, if at the expiration of that period another constitutional convention did not change it. When Bishop McQuaid wrote his comment on the Republican victory over the Democratic party to Archbishop Corrigan (November 7th, 1894), he remarked: "The course of Ireland and Malone helped some, but the party was past saving. The Republicans themselves had no idea how great their victory was to be." However, this did not prevent Bishop McQuaid from making the most of the circumstances in his denunciation of Archbishop Ireland's intervention in New York State politics to Rome, when he was forced to defend himself for his public attack on the Archbishop of St. Paul. Bishop McQuaid felt that something ought to be done, but what "is the puzzle. Archbishop Ireland has no sense of the propriety of things. Unfortunately he has with him the delegate . . . and hosts of others, including many of the Catholic newspapers. The bishops of the Province might take action, but we cannot depend on Buffalo." Under the circumstances, Bishop McQuaid finally decided to take the law into his own hands, and publicly depicted the

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

conduct of Archbishop Ireland in a carefully prepared address delivered in his own Cathedral (November 25th, 1894), concluding : " I also wish it to be understood that this meddling in the political affairs of another State by Archbishop Ireland is altogether exceptional, as he is the only bishop who thus interfered with others, that this scandal deserved rebuke as public as the offence committed. I sincerely hope that the Church will be spared its repetition." The charge hit the mark, and Bishop McQuaid informed his Metropolitan of the fact : " It seems that Ireland and Keane were at Atlantic City the Sunday my sermon was delivered. They were hopping mad, and took no pains to conceal their anger." Mgr. Satolli's ire was also roused. He sent the sermon to the Pope, and an admonition to Bishop McQuaid " on the wrong of attacking in this public manner an archbishop." However, Bishop McQuaid remarked : " He does not seem distressed by the notorious and scandalous behaviour of so exalted a personage as an archbishop." The delegate's letter received no reply, as Bishop McQuaid preferred to wait until he heard from Rome : " I may get an opportunity of telling them some other things, if much provoked." The expected word came from Rome in due time. Cardinal Rampolla informed Bishop McQuaid how painful and regretful the occurrence seemed to the Holy Father, and Propaganda expressed to Archbishop Corrigan the Pope's surprise and fear " lest discord and division prevail in the episcopal body." The Archbishop of New York was commissioned " to obtain some kind of reparation that may prevent friction between [Rochester] and St. Paul." He was therefore to invite Bishop McQuaid to a conference in New York city, and report the result to Rome. Bishop McQuaid then expressed to Cardinal Rampolla his sorrow at having caused the Holy Father any pain, but he saw no other way out of a difficulty that was entirely of Archbishop Ireland's creating. He promised the Cardinal Secretary of State that he would detail the motives of his attack on Archbishop Ireland in his letter to the Prefect of

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

Propaganda, Cardinal Ledochowski, who could then explain the whole matter to the Holy Father. Early in February, 1895, the document was finished in nineteen pages quarto. Bishop McQuaid himself confessed in its regard: "I have spoken very freely, and I think, it will set them a-thinking. There is more said than is written down. It may lead to further inquiry. I refer them to Bishop McDonnell and Archbishop Katzer for additional information on certain points. Whatever they may say of me and my sermon, I think that St. Paul will get a good lecture and a warning to mind his own business." Bishop McQuaid's attack on Archbishop Ireland was, of course, a document highly prized by Dr. Maignen in his indictment of the *Americanism*.

The autumn of 1896 brought changes in America that seemed significant to watchful eyes. Mgr. Keane of the Catholic University of Washington, was informed by Leo XIII (September 15th, 1896), that his "administration of this University now comes to an end, and that another Rector is to be appointed." He was given the choice either to remain in America or to come to Rome. His Holiness promised him a Metropolitan See if the American bishops elected him, or a position among the Consultors of the Congregation of Studies and the Congregation of Propaganda if he preferred to come to Rome. Bishop Keane (September 29th, 1896), wrote to Leo XIII that he chose to remain in America, "without any official position whatsoever, in tranquillity and peace." Despite this decision, Bishop Keane later went to Rome, and this made Bishop McQuaid watch for the news from Rome in the London *Tablet*, to which its Roman correspondent communicated a letter that made him remark: "They are beginning to puzzle over Keane's coming to Rome, and what they are going to do with him, and what he is going to do." If Bishop Keane was really tainted with liberalism, he had some years given him to work out his conversion before his elevation to archiepiscopal rank and final appointment to the Metropolitan See of Dubuque. Archbishop Ireland's conversion came

Bishop McQuaid of Rochester

earlier according to Bishop McQuaid's statement to his own Metropolitan (September 19th, 1896), that it was "just in time. I hope it will be permanent. He can never repair the harm he has been guilty of." Bishop McQuaid could not help but reflect on the "collapses on every side. . . . They were cock of the walk for a while, and dictated to the country and thought to run our diocese for us." A long cablegram from Rome in the *New York Journal* (November 12th, 1896), concerted with Bishop McQuaid's judgment: "It explains much. They are determined to break up liberalism in the University as its centre, and thus in the United States." Bishop McQuaid was under the impression that "the forbearance of Rome deceived the poor fellows. But at their age they ought to have known better. They are not talking now of knocking your mitre or mine off our heads. They had things their own way for a long while." The use made of the *Life of Thomas Hecker*, the founder of the Paulists, in these controversies caused some suspicion to fall on his Congregation. Bishop McQuaid could not see that the matter was any concern of the bishops outside of New York city, and he informed Archbishop Corrigan to that effect: "We have nothing to do about the Paulists. They are your diocesans, and if they are teaching heresies it is your business to reprove them. If they are not, there is nothing to be done. They should not be made scapegoats." Fortunately the clouds lifted in due time, and the Paulists have continued the work which Leo XIII had so highly recommended, though a little later he took occasion in his Apostolic Letter to distinguish true Americanism from false Americanism in religion. When Bishop McQuaid received the Brief from Rome transferring four counties from the Diocese of Buffalo to the Diocese of Rochester, he could not help remarking: "Evidently over there in Rome they can't bear me much ill-will for the lecture I gave Ireland, or they would not enlarge the Diocese of Rochester in my lifetime."

FREDERICK ZWIERLEIN.

THROUGH CONVENT WINDOWS

HEART OF GRACE

THE characteristics of a nation are expressed in its art, its humour, and its type of sanctity. Sanctity, however, because it is the truest fulfilment of humanity, includes humour and poetry and stands as the exponent of the time-spirit of a people. The women saints have been especially representative, partly on account of their less conventional education, and partly because the feminine nature, being more complex, has more capacity for many-sided self-revelation.

Canonized sanctity among Englishwomen seems a thing of the far past. St. Margaret of Scotland was, indeed, an Atheling and a Saxon; but her holiness was achieved in her adopted country, and her name stands almost alone from the early popular canonizations of the age of St. Hilda, St. Walburga, and the great group of abbesses, queens, and missionaries to the days of Tudor persecution when Margaret Clitheroe gained her palm. The distance from Rome may have had something to do with it; but the fact remains that, with few exceptions, even the men saints were not monks and hermits, but kings and ecclesiastics, conspicuous in political life and known beyond seas by their connection with affairs of state.* Literature, however, has saved for posterity what history might have lost, and, in the centuries from the Norman Conquest to the Reformation, the spiritual thought and inspiration of England finds expression in the prose and verse of its hidden saints.

Among these unknown ones Mother Juliana, of Norwich, is little more than a name as far as her personal record goes. The Benedictine, Serenus de Cressy, who

* St. Stephen Harding and St. Ælred are notable exceptions; yet the former, though an Englishman, was distinguished upon French soil, where, as one of the co-founders of the Cistercians, he became the novice-master of Bernard of Clairvaux.

Through Convent Windows

published the revelations in 1670, writes in his Preface : "After all the search I could make, I could not discover anything touching her, more than what she occasionally sprinkles in the book itself." The title tells us all we are ever likely to know of this tender woman whose beautiful nature rises to meet the reader up out of the pages of her book. The title reads : *XVI Revelations of Divine Love, shewed to a Devout Servant of Our Lord, called Mother Juliana, an Anchorete of NORWICH : who lived in the Dayes of King Edward the Thirde. Published by R. F. S. Cressy. Accedite ad Deum et Illuminamini. Printed in the Year MDCLXX.* This monk had been originally Hugh Cressy, a Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. He took Anglican orders and became chaplain to Wentworth, Lord Strafford. Later he was named Canon of Windsor (1642). He became a Catholic in 1646 and joined the Benedictines at Douai. After a few years of conventual life he was sent to England, served for a time as chaplain to the Portuguese Queen of Charles II, and finally retired to East Grinstead where, as chaplain to Richard Caryl, he died in 1674. Besides the *Revelations*, he published, or republished, *The Divine Cloud of Unknowing*, Walter Hilton's *Scale of Perfection*, and Father Baker's *Sancta Sophia*, which he "methodically digested," as the title remarks, from the separate manuscripts of the Benedictine mystic. So that Mother Juliana's discoverer was an interesting man in himself, with a genius for bringing to light beautiful hidden things. He presented the first printed edition of the *Revelations* to Lady Mary Blount, of Sodington, "as a small present to which, notwithstanding, I can challenge no interest or right, but only the care of publishing it. The author of it is a person of your own sex who lived about three hundred years since, intended it for you and for such readers as yourself, who will not be induced to the perusing of it by curiosity or the desire to know strange things, which afterwards they will, at best, vainly admire, or perhaps out of incredulity, contemn. But your Ladyship will, I assure myself, afford her a place in your closet, where, at your devout retire-

Through Convent Windows

ments, you will enjoy her saint-like conversation, attending to her, while with humility and joy she recounts to you the wonders of Our Lord's love to her, and of His grace in her." It is a temptation to digress further in the direction of the monk, and the lady to whom he offered his treasure, for nothing is more interesting than the study of a human soul in its relation to God, and the side issues of a holy life add to its value and charm.

In the library of the Holy Child Convent, St. Leonards-on-Sea, is a copy of the now rare 1843 edition of the *Revelations*, belonging originally to Father J. Jones, the owner of the estate before it passed into the hands of the nuns. The Preface, by the Anglican G. H. Parker, is pencilled with corrective comments of the old-fashioned Catholic priest who had no idea of sharing the holy "anchorete" with heretics. Here and there throughout the book one finds a hand in the margin pointing to some sentence which has cheered and enlightened a reader who was not the most facile of characters and had his own troubles. In that lovely fortieth chapter, where the Divine Lover comforts the soul repentant of its sin, the marginal hand points severely to the remarks of Mother Juliana on the subject of repeating the sin because coveting the joy of being again forgiven!

Our courteous Lord sheweth Himself to the (sorrowing) soul merrily and full of glad cheare, with friendly welcoming as if it had been in pain and in prison, saying thus: "My dear darling, I am glad thou art come to me in all thy woe; I have ever been with thee, and now see'st thou me loving, and we be oned in bliss." . . . But now because of all this ghostly comfort, if any man or woman be stirred by folly to say or to think, "If this be true, then were it good to sin," (here the hand points) "beware of this stirring, for truly if it comes it is untrue and of the enemy; for the same true love that teacheth us all by his blessed comfort, the same blessed love teacheth us that we shall hate sin only for love."

How all this is unconsciously repeated by Coventry Patmore's nun daughter in her letter about *Remembered Grace*: "Anyone who would offend God on such a

Through Convent Windows

consideration could never have really known and loved Him." This letter was written in the same house where, on the library-shelf, reposes Dame Juliana's book with the warning hand drawn by the old priest. What a little thing is time after all, and how very much we are alike through the centuries, with only the sad difference, as in northern countries, of something real and living having been suffered to go from us and something shadowy and unsubstantial put in its place; the tabernacles of England's lovely cathedrals and village churches despoiled of their treasures and the Book of Common Prayer put upon their benches instead; Our Lady and the Holy Child gone from Westminster Abbey and statesmen and poets enshrined; incarnate Love chased out by law and incarnate respectability brought in. The atmosphere generated by centuries of conventionality has permeated even Catholic souls, and the chill of the Reformation is still upon us. Yet the inherent religiousness of Englishmen has preserved a formal worship even if they were robbed in great measure of the realization which makes the joy of love. The singers of the Seventeenth Century beat upon the bars of their caged souls for their lost air and sunshine, then drooped and died in the stodgy atmosphere of the approaching Eighteenth Century. But the next age broke out into wistful longing and fierce desire, and now it sometimes looks as if the simple mysticism of the holy "anchorete" may, little by little, be recovered after all. That much over-used and ill-used word, mysticism, expresses no secret doctrine, no esoteric possession. It means that the soul is in love with Love, and Love is the great simplicity as well as the great mystery, since who can define or even describe it? "None but Thyself can alter Thee." It is the bliss of the baby in its mother's arms. It is something that is expressed by the poet:

Now lies the earth all Danaë to the stars,
And all my soul lies open unto Thee.

Out of this unthinking happiness come the great activities of Love.

Through Convent Windows

The chief devotion of pre-Reformation England, the natural outcome of her tender attitude towards the Sacred Humanity, was the Passion. Mother Juliana asked for a better knowledge of this merciful showing of Love, and out of the answer to her prayer came the *XVI Revelations*: "I received a mightie desire to receive three wounds in my life, that is to say, the wound of verie contrition, the wound of kind compassion, and the wound of willful longing to God." Divine Love stands in the place of every human relation. The heart of man cries instinctively to God, "Abba, Father." St. Teresa emphasizes the Divine kingliness. "*Su Maesta*" is her word of reference—it falls in with the dignity of the Spanish character. St. Catherine of Siena turns to the Divine Loverhood: "O Christ Love, Christ Love, come into my heart!" To Mother Juliana belongs the privilege of bringing to light the Motherhood of God:

As verilie as God is our Father, as verilie is God our Mother: and that shewed he in all and namely in these words which he saith: "I it am"; that is to say, "I it am, the might and goodness of the Father-head; I it am the wisdom and the kindness of the Mother-head; . . . I it am, the high sovereign goodness of all manner of thing; I it am that maketh thee to long; I it am, the endless fulfilling of all true desires." The mother may lay her child tenderly to her breast; but our tender Mother Jesu he may homely lead us into his blessed breast by his sweet open side, and shew us there in party of the Godhead, and the joyes of heaven . . . He may feed us with himself, and doth full courteously and full tenderly with the Blessed Sacrament; that is precious food of verie life . . . This fair lovely word, Mother, it is so sweet and so kind in itself, that it may not verily be said of none, ne to none but of him, and to him, that is the very Mother of life and of all . . . The kind loving mother that wotteth and knoweth the need of her child, she keepeth it full tenderly, as the kind and condition of mother-head will; and ever as it waxeth in age and in stature, she changeth the works, but not her love: and when it is waxed of more age, she suffereth that it be chastened; in breaking down of vices, to make the child receive vertues and grace . . . And he will that we know it, for he will have all our love fastned to him . . . And this was

Through Convent Windows

shewed in all : and namely in the high plentious words, where he saith : " I it am that thou lovest."

It remained for a hidden English mystic of our own time to claim the reverse relationship and cry from a soul aflame with the same love that enkindled the recluse of the Fourteenth Century :

Draw me and I will come : Thou wilt forgive
If erring, choice of Thee, despised and small ;
Sweet Holy Child, let me no longer live,
But Thou in me, my God, my CHILD, my All!

—*Emily Honoria Patmore.*

The artist sister of Thérèse of Lisieux has embodied these lines in that exquisite picture of " La Vierge Mère," full of the boldness of the old masters, and with something of that mediæval power and simplicity which puts life into the canvas. The Mother might be the " Pauline " of the biography ; the Child seems rather the work of memory than imagination, so ineffable is His beauty. As it was painted at Thérèse's request, this might well be the picture by a saint, of a saint, out of the contemplation of a saint.

The characteristic piety of Juliana's age was not represented only by its prose writers. Sanctity and poetry meet and embrace in every age. Juliana is of the time of Chaucer. And just as there is the possibility of Chaucerian humour in the recluse, so, here and there, the poet finds expression for a homely piety of his own akin to hers, though on a lower level. Those two tender verses towards the close of *Troilus and Cressida*—" O younge freshe folkes, he or she," etc.—belong to the age of Mother Juliana. Throughout the devotional poetry of Norman and Plantagenet times one finds always the same Julian note of caressing, clinging, homely intimacy ; not passionate and vehement and Southern, but steadfast, deep, Northern. Miss Segar has collected and modernized some of these touching, lovely verses in *A Mediæval Anthology*, prefaced by an illuminating appreciation of the spirit of those valuable centuries. It is hard to choose among these gems of quaint sweetness, but a few

Through Convent Windows

extracts will show how the verses of these unknown lovers kept pace with the prose works of Richard Rolle, and Walter Hilton, and the Norwich Anchorete :

My Leman is so meek,
So courteous, sweet and still ;
Full gentle is His speach
His words are never grille (harsh) ;
But good He wills to each,
Forget He would all ill ;
And if I flee He will me seek,
With love He will me till (entice).

I will in at Thy sleeve
All in Thine heart to be,
Mine heart shall burst and cleave
Ere untrue thou me see.

How lovely is the Lullaby Carol of Our Lady :

I saw a fair maiden
Sitten and sing,
She lullèd a litele Child
A sweete Lording—

Lullay, mine Liking, my dear Son, my Sweeting.
Lullay, my dear Heart, mine own dear Darling.

Again :

Jesu, Lord, my Sweeting,
Hold me ever in Thy keeping,
Make of me thy darling
That I love thee over all thing.

Jesu, sweet, my dim heart gleam,
Brighter than the sonne's beam,
As thou wert born in Bethlehem,
Make in me thy love-dream—
Jesu, Jesu, my honey sweet,
My heart, my comforting.

Some of these songs of love-longing are no doubt influenced by St. Bernard's hymn in the great Cistercian age of England. One, however, stands quite alone, full of English wistfulness and intensity. The wonderful single line of *Quia Amore Languet* : "To love the loving

Through Convent Windows

is no mastery, is a revelation of the Delight in Pursuit ; of the dominating Patience of the fierce and sweet Conqueror."

I will abide her till she be ready,
I will her sue if she say nay ;
If she be reckless, I will be steady,
If she be dangerous, I will her pray.
If she wepe then hide I ne may.
My arms are outstretched to clip her to me,
Crying, " Now, soul, I come! Soul, stay to me
Quia amore langueo.
Thou weepest, thou gladdest ; I sit thee by,
Yet wouldst thou but once, dear, look on me!"

This is in the very spirit of Mother Juliana's mysticism, direct, human, yet ineffable in its significance. " For when a soul is tempted, troubled, and left to herself by her unrest, then it is time to pray, to make herself supple and buxom (compliant) to God ; but she by no manner of prayer maketh him supple to her, *for he is ever one like in love.*" Her great argument for prayer is that it *oneth* the soul to Him : " And also our good Lord shewed that it is full great pleasure to him that a *seelie* (simple) soule come to him naked, plainlie and homelie . . . for in us is his homeliest home and his endless dwelling." The lines of the great modern mystic poet again ring the changes on the "homely" word, so truly English in its value and meaning :

How full of bonds and simpleness
Is God,
How narrow is He,
And how the wide waste field of possibility
Is only trod
Straight to His homestead in the human heart.

—Coventry Patmore.

Deep down in the English heart will ever be this sense of this Divine home-coming, the shutting of the door and the delicious secrecy of the mystic supper. [‡] It is hard to quote with restraint from the *Revelations*. The eye is arrested on this page and that by so many heavenly-

Through Convent Windows

human things. Her frequent use of the words "homely" and "courteous" expresses something that came out of that ineffable intercourse to develop and perfect her own human qualities. One might almost fancy that she had caught the echo of Dante's oft-repeated "*Questa cortissima*." He died only twenty-two years before her birth.

The revelations of the saints are made through the medium of their own personalities, which are original and vivid because so simply open to the action of Life and Love and Truth. They stand shining in the sun as they really are: with no cloud of self-consciousness to blur the picture. Because they have gone all the way of the great love-adventure, they have perfectly and humanly fulfilled themselves and stand as the finished types of their age and nation. No one but an Englishwoman of pre-Reformation times could have written the *Revelations* with their distinct note of *comfort*. This "anchorete" stands before us out of her hidden life as the flower of the womanhood of her century and country, homely, trustworthy, courteous, "buxom," "supple," and tender. This dear creature, who had chosen solitude for herself, could not restrain the generous instinct to pass on her treasures to her kind, as who should say, "O my dear darlings, we needs, indeed must, toil and live the pilgrim life, but inside it all is love and love is motherly and merciful. The way is long, but He is the Way, and whate'er betide, 'wit it well, Love is His meaning.'" She cares so wistfully, this separated woman, for all the world from which she hid away. There is one feature of Mother Juliana's spiritual experience which differentiates her from her Italian and Spanish sisters. Catherine and Teresa do not ache with the problem of life. Juliana does. She peers into the mystery of sin and pain and cries aloud in all the troubled faith of the modern:

I cannot see—

I, child of process, if there lies

Any An end for me,

Full of repose, full of replies.

Through Convent Windows

The Divine answer never comes in the precise terms of the question ; but it does meet the age and the mind of the questioner and brings its separate inspiration :

I'll not reproach
The road that winds, my feet that err.
Access, Approach
Art Thou, Time, Way, and Wayfarer.

To the Fourteenth Century recluse the all-embracing answer comes and is passed on to our complex times : " Our good Lord would not that the soul were afraid of this ugly sight (the misery of the world). But I saw not sin ; for I believe it had no manner of substance, ne no part of being, ne it might not be known but by the pain that is caused thereof . . . It is true that sin is the cause of all this pain ; *but all shall be well and all manner of thing shall be well. Thou shalt see thyself that all manner of thing shall be well . . .* we should know our own feebleness and mischief that we be fallen in by sin, to *meek us and make us cry to God for help and grace.*" A poet's intuition follows a saint's inspiration five centuries later :

The evil is null, is naught, is silence implying sound.
What was good shall be good, with for evil so much good more.
—*Abt. Vogler.*

In what English garden was the little girl of three playing when the great Italian saint of Siena first opened her eyes upon the same sunshine as that which fell upon the future anchorete of Norwich ? We know nothing of Juliana's antecedents, of the circumstances which led to her seclusion, of her possible friends. We have only the internal evidence of a sweet and womanly nature, and of a clear intellect, in spite of her one allusion to herself as " a simple, unlettered creature living in the deadlie flesh." The rest is silence. No contemporary tells us anything of her. Of Catherine Benincasa, on the contrary, we know everything that can be known, from the cradle to the tomb. Her external life was passed in the

Through Convent Windows

midst of local gossip, for the Benincasas were many, and Italians are talkative ; and, in spite of her twenty-six children, Lapa seems to have had plenty of time to chat with her neighbours. Catherine was the twenty-fifth child. Her twin-sister died, and Lapa fretted for her till a twenty-sixth consoled her by bearing the dead baby's name, Giovanna. Lapa had the courage of her convictions, with no difficulty in expressing them ; and one is tempted to imagine the reception she would be likely to give to a modern humanitarian health-visitor who might dare to inquire into the prodigious family which she so blithely and independently bestowed on the already teeming population of Siena. There would have been "winged words," indeed, of unforgettable quality, and a possible box on the ear ; for Lapa kept up her health and spirits in spite of the absorbing business of her life, and had, moreover, a fine temper of her own. When her darling and best beloved twenty-fifth blossomed out into a most delectable baby and then a bonny little girl, the neighbours took turns in borrowing the treasure for their personal delight, and Catherine was nicknamed "Eufrosina." As most of Lapa's family survived and flourished, the good Lapa's house must have been overflowing with children ; so that the little Joy of the household lived in the public eye, first in her noisy little home and later in the conspicuousness of her strange mission to the turbulent world of her day. History treats the saint who comes in the train of events as a casual incident ; but to the saint's chronicles history is merely a circumstance to furnish the setting for the real life lived in all its fullness in the midst ; Catherine not only belonged to a notable period of history : she made history even in its political aspect. Her thirty-three years were included in the longer span of Juliana's life, and we can but wonder if the English recluse, whose secret history belongs to a soul as palpitating, loving and aware as that of her great Southern sister, knew aught of her goings and comings, her words and deeds which belonged not to Siena but to the Universal Church. The English

Through Convent Windows

instinct, at least, was sound in choosing the right side in the tortuous puzzle of the Western schism; and among Catherine's followers we find two Englishmen, the hermit of Lecceto, William Flete, and another of doubtful reputation indeed, but conspicuous activity, the free-lance Sir John Hawkwood, upon whom, in spite of his lawlessness, Catherine had smiled, and his soul was sunlit. The Tuscan saint was Italian to the core, and in her holiness stood as the perfect exponent of that strange mixture of astuteness and simplicity, of passion and sweetness, of something utterly childlike with a capacity for splendid intrigue and administration, of a sense of the practical and commonplace with the artistic faculty in its highest development. Catherine followed swiftly upon Dante's retreating footsteps; Petrarch was even then writing his sonnets; the greatest Tuscan painters had not yet achieved their full measure of expression, but art was at hand to follow poetry in the train of the Eufrosina of her age. In her time, Tuscany, with its neighbouring provinces, was the storm centre of Italy; and to the storm she belongs, though not of it. It would seem as if, in that terrible era, so disorderly, avaricious, revengeful and violent, it was as much as a man could do to steer his way through it all without being privately poisoned or publicly executed, unless he managed to evade time by living in eternity in some hiding-place of prayer. It was because Catherine so thoroughly understood contemporary character and history that she gradually developed her unique genius for peace-making. Certainly she had ample opportunity for home practice with the outspoken Lapa, who adored and tormented her so vehemently.

Catherine's humour was of the playful sort, brave and warm, but piercing enough in the home thrusts of her adroit Tuscan tongue. Woman-like she scolds most loving-ruthlessly those she loves best. Her melancholy Neri, the sensitive poet; her negligent Stefano; the obstinate English hermit who stood upon his rights and would not leave his wooded hermitage when she ordered him to Rome; even the devoted Raimondo, all come in

Through Convent Windows

for her swift-sweet chidings and her arch remarks. Yet how she loves them all—this affectionate woman whose heart is not her own because it is Another's, and, because of that, belongs to all the world. The full tide of its tenderness flows out upon the oppressed, the sorrowing, the frightened and broken. Who could resist the aching sweetness of her ministry to the poor, hot-headed youth under his death sentence. It is not wonderful that he met his end "with cries of victory on his severed breath" while those caressing hands were so near, so felt, in their last sustaining pressure. Catherine is eminently motherly; the natural inheritance from so prolific a mother, developed into an all-embracing motherliness of soul for mankind. Barduccio calls her "this blessed virgin and mother of thousands of souls." Stefano, the "Caterinato," whom she specially cherished for his happy nature and chivalrous instincts, tells us of a little talk between them which reveals her pretty, maternal way with her favourite: "That most holy virgin," writes the spoilt youth, "said to me in secret: 'Know, most beloved son, that the greatest desire thou hast will soon be fulfilled.' At this I was astonished, for I could think of nothing that I longed for in the world; . . . therefore I said: 'O dearest Mother, what is the greatest desire that I have?' 'Look,' she said, 'into thy heart.' And I answered her: 'Certainly, most beloved Mother, I can find no greater desire in myself than to keep always near you.' And she straightway replied: 'And this will be.'"

Even when she calls the "Christ on earth" her "*Babbo mio*," one feels her motherhood at the back of all her naïve submission; coaxing, persuading, almost commanding him to do the right. Fra Raimondo, her faithful confessor, receives her gentle chiding along with her humble confidence. When he is attacked by enemies she calls him her "*poverello calunniato*." She writes to him as to her ghostly father; but, even while doing so, she mothers the modest and retiring friar with wholesome exhortations to fortitude and energy. The favourites of the saints must needs be relatively interesting; yet

Through Convent Windows

Catherine and Teresa both seem stronger, even by nature, than their Raimondo and Gratian.

If Juliana is of Chaucer's time and Catherine lived in the aftermath of Dante's glory, Teresa of Spain, although of the time and country of Cervantes, belonged temperamentally and intellectually to the age of Shakespeare, whose genius was at the dawn of life while her flaming heart was beating in its twilight. Her *debonnair* high spirits, her swift repartee, the racy quality of her wit, her teasing propensity, are truly Shakespearean. The same era had seen both saint and poet touched into fire and song. The famous "bantering letter" in the sudden turn of the sentences, in the merry little side-issues of criticism, in the largeness of its outlook, and the cleverness of its conclusions, reminds us more than once of the manner of certain ladies of the immortal dramas. Teresa had asked her brother to explain the meaning of words spoken to her in prayer: "Seek thyself in Me." In his perplexity, Lorenzo had summoned to his assistance Francisco de Salcedo, Father Julian of Avila, and St. John of the Cross. A bishop, a friend of hers, who was interested in the matter, requested Teresa to write her own judgment on the four treatises. She says that when she received them, she had such a violent headache that she could hardly read them. She certainly had rallied when she penned her reply:

Unless I were obliged, my lord, under obedience, I should not answer, and for good reasons I should refuse to judge the subject under discussion. Not, however, as my sisters will have it, because my brother, being one of the rival competitors, my affection for him would give reason to suspect my impartiality. No, for all the competitors are dear to me, having all helped me in my labours. Moreover, my brother was the last comer, who only appeared as we finished drinking the chalice—(evidently his MS. was the last to be given in)—but he also shared it; and he shall have even a better share later on, by the grace of God. May God grant, too, that I may say nothing which may cause me to be denounced to the Inquisition; for my head is tired out with the number of letters and other things which I have had to write since last night; but as obedience can do anything with me,

Through Convent Windows

I am going to comply, well or ill, with your lordship's orders. I should have liked to take a little time to read over and enjoy the papers ; but you are not satisfied with my doing this and I must obey. First of all, it appears that the words in question come from the spouse of our souls, and he says to them: "Seek thyself in me." I do not require now to conclude that Don Francisco is beside the question when he says that it signifies that God is present in everything. Truly, a grand discovery! But here is something more, and unless Don Francisco does not contradict it, I shall have to denounce him to my neighbour, the Inquisition. He is for ever saying and repeating in his paper, "St. Paul says that the Holy Ghost expresses himself in this way"; and after that, he says, by way of conclusion, that his essay is full of follies! He will certainly have to retract as quickly as he can, or he will see what will happen.

As for Father Julian, he begins well but ends badly; thus he will certainly not get the prize. He is not asked here to explain how the uncreated and created light became united; nor what a soul feels who is perfectly united to her Creator; nor whether in this state she differs or not from her Divine Objective. Again, what does he mean by the expression "When the soul is purified"? As for me, I believe virtues and purification of the soul are insufficient here, because it is a question of a supernatural state, and a gift that God bestows on whomever He pleases, and if anything could predispose the soul to receive it, it would be love. But I forgive him his digressions because he has at least one merit: he is less lengthy than my Father John of the Cross. The doctrine of the last-named would be excellent for one who wished to make the spiritual exercises; here they are out of place. We should be much to be pitied if we could not seek God before being dead to the world. What! Were the Magdalen, the Samaritan woman, the Canaanitess, already dead to the world when they found their Saviour?

He enlarges greatly on the necessity of uniting oneself with God in order to be made one wholly with Him. But when that happens, when the soul has received this signal favour from God, He can no longer tell her to seek Him, for she has already found Him. The Lord preserve me from people who are so spiritual that they wish, without choice or examination, to bring all back to a perfect state of contemplation. We must, withal, do him the justice of acknowledging that he has explained remarkably well what we never asked to know. This comes of discussing such a subject; the profit one reaps from it is the one we least expected

Through Convent Windows

to get! This is precisely what has happened to Don Lorenzo de Ceepeda. We are much obliged to him for his answers and his verses. He was speaking somewhat out of his depth. But in consideration of the little treat he has given us, we willingly forgive his want of humility in treating upon subjects which, as he himself acknowledges, were so much above him. He would deserve, however, to be expostulated with for the good advice he gives devout souls—without their having asked for it—to practise the prayer of quiet, as if it depended on them; God grant that he may get some good of his intercourse with such spiritual minded people! Still his work did not fail to please me, though I think he had great reason to be ashamed of it. In short, my lord, it is impossible to decide which of these writings is the best.

The bishop then ordered the saint to write her own commentary on the mysterious sentence. Teresa, the delightful tease, is at once Teresa of the Flaming Heart, and she writes:

My beloved, passing fair,
Love has drawn thy likeness, see
In thy inmost heart, and there
—Lost or straying unaware
Thou must seek thyself in Me—
Well I know that thou shalt find
This thine image in My Heart,
Pictured to the life with art
So amazing that thy mind
Sees thy very counterpart.
If by chance thou e'er shalt doubt
Where to turn in search of Me,
Seek not all the world about,
Only this can find Me out—
Thou must seek Myself in thee.

In the mansion of thy mind
Is my dwelling-place, and more
There I wander unconfined,
Knocking loud, if e'er I find
In thy heart a closed door.

Search for Me without were vain,
Since when thou hast need of Me
Only call Me, and again
To thy side I haste amain,
Thou must seek Myself in thee.

Through Convent Windows

The concentration of the original Spanish must suffer even in so just a translation.

The greatest of the Spanish painters were yet to come. Velasquez was born at the end of Teresa's century, and Murillo in the year of Shakespeare's death; but the saint may have seen the fruits of Raphael's or Leonardo's finished genius, or of those Tuscan pre-Raphaelites, some of whose masterpieces may have found their way into Spain. The Venetian school was at the height of its splendour in her time; Titian and Tintoretto painted while Teresa prayed. It was a great era of Sanctity and Art—Teresa, Ignatius, Francis Xavier, Philip Neri, Sir Thomas More and many another English martyr bestarred those darkened spiritual skies while Michelangelo wrought and Shakespeare sang. Elizabeth Tudor and Mary of Scots were of Teresa's time. It is interesting to conjecture what might have come of a meeting between this queen of prayer and those queens across the seas. Elizabeth would have found more than her match in intellect and will; while that other tragic earthly lover may have owed to the hidden Carmelite nun (in the inscrutable economy of God's dispensation) those graces of her long imprisonment which led her at last to the mountain-peaks of love for which her frail but noble heart was destined. There is no trace of such contemporaneous reference in Teresa's writings. She speaks generally of heresy and disorder and the need of prayer and reparation, but her vision is concentrated inward rather than outward, and the world-news came to her only as a distant echo. It throws at least one pleasing light on Philip II of Spain—that he honoured the saint and took her part more than once in her ecclesiastical troubles. But certain it is that the undaunted Daughter of Desires reached Seventeenth Century England through the soul and song of Richard Crashaw, who thankfully acknowledges her influence in the turning of his water into wine: "O pardon, if I dare to say, Thine own dear books were guilty." How apt, in our own day, is the meaning of his lines:

Through Convent Windows

We may maintain
Peace, sure, with piety though it come from Spain.
What soul soe'er in any language can
Speak Heav'n like her, is my soul's countryman.
O 'tis not Spanish, but 'tis Heaven she speaks.

And so, with Crashaw's rhymed charity to justify us, we may include, in passing, that great type of all that was best and healthiest in the German mysticism of the Thirteenth Century, Gertrude the Great, that beautiful expression of the Benedictine spirit, and the worthy predecessor of Catherine and Teresa.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

PLATO declared that the money-maker's or the soldier's nature could not experience the pleasures of the philosopher, nor even guess what they might mean. Should, then, the philosopher tell the soldier what philosophical pleasure was, and deny that the soldier's idea of it were true, the soldier would have to take it upon faith; and, in short, the two could scarcely argue. And the public would stay unconvinced. I remember this, when I feel inclined to say, just dogmatically, that Jesuits and their pupils simply do not think and feel like those of whom Mr. Anthony Brendon tells us in the *Bonfire* (Heinemann).

Therefore I will first mention a few details, external enough and trivial, but which no one need find it hard to verify. At Benediction the priest doesn't wear a chasuble, nor lace upon his cassock, nor (in Jesuit colleges anyhow) enter carrying the monstrance; nor on Ash Wednesday are images veiled in purple, nor altar "draped" in black, nor are the candles removed "save two," nor made of brown wax "with little spikes stuck in them." Nor are the blessed ashes taken from the fireplace, nor mixed with oil, nor does the priest receive them on his forehead. Jesuits are, they say, careless about ceremonies; but even they do not recite the *Domine non sum dignus* just before the consecration; nor are collections made or sermon preached just after it. Jesuits in this country do, indeed, wear "wings," but these are not "long wide sleeves in which they hide things because they have no pockets." Nor yet do rectors, I feel sure, rise at six, only to go straight to the "common-room" to join "the other priests," whom they find there discussing the indecent pictures in a confiscated paper. Nor do boys in Retreat adjourn to public recreation-rooms to talk.

Well, then, the talk! I am sure Catholic boys do not allude to the "incorruptible body of *St. Ambrogius*" (I believe the author has visited Milan and seen the church of Sant' Ambrogio, and the incorrupt body of San

Bonfire

Carlo in the Cathedral, and got mixed), nor to the liquefaction of the blood of St. Eustachius. I am sure, too, that priests do not silence doubts as to eternal punishment by saying: "It's in the Catechism, authorized by the Bishop." I doubt if Jesuits lure boys to a "seminary" by hopes of ultimate great power, recalling how the Society has "deposed Emperors and enthroned Popes," and how dangerous are Jesuits to make enemies of. Nor will any Luke, though dying, be found to say to any Harry, after a conversation which puts Eric for ever in the shade: "I feel so happy now: I have so loved you, Harry . . . all the beautiful woods are *alive in you* . . ." And so on.

If, then, the *mise en scène* is so inaccurate, and the talk so thoroughly impossible, it will seem not unlikely that the incidents, too, are impossible, though doubtless everything happens at least once in the world's history. It is conceivable that a priest—"a fine type"—should commit suicide, having "loved too much and too wildly," though unlikely that a boy should proceed to print high-heeled shoe marks under the priest's windows, or that the community should discuss "exorcising" the devil who had left black finger-marks in the dormitory near to the dead man's room. It is conceivable that the Jesuit, Father Simson, should be saved from dying in a panic of hell and worms, only by a visit of an old priest who, through pitying "hypocrisy," says with him the *Hail Mary* he doesn't believe in (that the author twice gets the *Hail Mary* right exonerates him, I suppose, for quoting it once wrong); and that a secular priest should be habitually racked by similar nightmares before his death; and that a lady should be quite glad to upset a lamp and burn her house down with her husband in it, because he, too, possessed by the thought of hell, had made her life a misery; but that this and much more of the sort should be able justifiably to combine within the framework of one book is impossible in the extreme. Even Octave Mirbeau never dreamt of any such unrealism! So at last we may safely say that since the book gives no

Some Recent Books

probable presentment of a department of life, so neither does it of one boy's soul, though, again, it is conceivable that a mentality might exist which should alchemize all it sees and hears into food for its fixed idea of hell. (The author, I notice, if "fire" be omitted, sees in hell "a mere place of *harmless* banishment where the punishment was to be deprived of the sight of God.") Mr. Brendon, however, tries quite hard to be fair: nor do I deny the truth of plenty of his touches; also he introduces a nice bishop, and a nice secular priest; he states that the "secret" of the confessional is respected, and has a little *coda* in which he declares that this "recognition by the Jesuits of the spiritual values of life" is the "supreme excellence" of their education, "a treasure which abides until death," and to which "the boys look back with gratitude." Also, that their system of "patrolling" preserves, at not too high a price, and alone can preserve, a standard of bodily purity; and that the Jesuits, in thus acting, are "on the whole right." However, we hear a lot too much of altar-boys "like two lovely girls," "chosen for their beauty to do homage to God," while another boy (oddly, *not* the thurifer, though swinging incense) is "of outstanding loveliness, with a face of wondrous pallor, like a white hyacinth seen in the sunset's after-glow." (I may say that though the author's main documents on hell appear to have been bought in 1918, this sort of thing seems to belong much more to about 1880.) And the only Jesuit whom I thought I was going to like (he enjoyed snuff and disliked the feast-day sherry, and from time to time talked sense) is absorbed in the thought of his dead inamorata, looks forward to heaven mainly in order to meet her there, doesn't believe in dogma, and invites boys to woodland walks in order to hear the pipes of Pan.

In short, I have alternately felt that this book was written by, say, a Protestant master in a Jesuit school, who had had his leg very badly pulled by the boys and was also cheated by his preconceived ideas; or else, by a man who has, alas, suffered what he describes, and,

Father Lagrange's Works

unable to see or hear the outside save awry, is necessarily all wrong about the interior world of feeling and motive. So I would like this review of a book which has been much talked about to count as a verdict not so much against the author as against a publisher for stooping quite so low.

C. C. M.

FATHER LAGRANGE'S *Sens du Christianisme*, made up of ten lectures given at the Catholic Institute of Paris last winter, reviews the answers given in Protestant Germany, since the days of Luther, to the question, What is Christianity? The hope he expresses that his exposition and refutation of these conflicting systems of exegesis may weaken a pernicious influence which is felt in England and America as well as in France, suggests the question whether English-speaking Catholics have sufficiently utilized the works of this very learned Dominican* in their defence of the traditional ideas concerning the nature of Christ and of His institutions. The history and interpretation of the sacred books of ancient Israel claimed most of the attention of Father Lagrange until the year 1902, when M. Loisy published his book on *The Gospel and the Church*. In his lectures at the Catholic Institute of Toulouse in that year,† he enunciated, indeed, principles which govern the exegesis of the New Testament as well as that of the Old; but he applied them only to such problems as the history of the first eleven chapters of Genesis and the character of the civil laws of the Israelites. His commentary on Judges was completed in the same year. It was no surprise, however, to those who were acquainted with his erudition and versatility, that he took up the gauntlet thrown by M. Loisy to Catholic theologians. The criticism of M. Loisy's book, in the *Revue Biblique* (April, 1903), and the open letter to Mgr. Battifol came

* *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs* (150 B.C.-200 A.D.), 1909; *Evangelium selon Saint Marc*, 1911; *Epître aux Romains*, 1916; *Epître aux Galates*, 1918.

† Translated by the Rev. Edward Myers, M.A., under the title *Historical Criticism and the Old Testament*.

Some Recent Books

from a master who could show with full knowledge not only that Loisy's manifesto was irreconcilable with Catholic faith, but that it was based upon a conception of history and a system of exegesis which were unsound. Ever since, Father Lagrange has been on the defensive, an apologist; and the traditional system which he has been upholding is that which is concerned with such questions as the teaching of Our Lord about the time of the end of the world, the nature of His kingdom, His personal claims.

The books which most directly deal with the issues raised in France by M. Loisy include the treatise on Messianic ideas in the period 150 B.C. to A.D. 200, and the commentary on St. Mark's Gospel. M. Loisy, following Johannes Weiss, the head of the eschatological school, had exposed the utter unreality of that Liberal Protestant conception of Jesus which Mrs. Ward, for instance, imposed upon Robert Elsmere in the name of a science made in Germany. It was not the Jesus of history, but an idealized Liberal Protestant pastor. In the reaction against this deformation, Weiss insisted that Jesus was a man of His time, sharing its ideas and hopes. Now, in those days, the Jews were looking for the establishment of the reign of God. It was shortly to be inaugurated by an intervention of God, sudden and catastrophic, which would bring about the end of the present world and create a world of innocence and happiness. And such was the reign of God which Jesus heralded. He did not bring it about by His own action; like everyone else He waited for God to inaugurate it by an unheard-of miracle. He was Himself the future King of this future Kingdom. So absorbed was He in this thought of the reign of God which was about to come, that He did not think of founding a Church or any other permanent institutions; His moral teaching was adapted to the state of a world about to end. He waited for a Kingdom, and the Church came. Father Lagrange saw that the sophism of the eschatologists consisted, first, in representing all our Lord's

Father Lagrange's Works

contemporaries as holding one consistent view of what the reign of God was to be ; and, secondly, in attributing this one idea to Jesus notwithstanding the evidence that He had a most independent mind. The contention of the eschatologists is that when we look at Jesus in the light of history we see a "recognizable Jew of the first century, with the traceable limitations of such a man." Now, as Mr. Chesterton pointed out very well in the *Hibbert Journal* (July, 1909), this is precisely what we do not see.

In the *Messianisme chez les Juifs* we are introduced to the ideas held by such Hellenic Jews as Josephus and Philo ; to those which may be disengaged from the apocryphal apocalypses ; to those of the Rabbis of Palestine ; and, finally, an historical account is given of "messianism in action." What the eschatologists presented so confidently as "the Jewish concept" of the kingdom (and some Catholic writers have followed them too readily) is shown to be the concept of a few groups of Our Lord's contemporaries. In his Commentary on St. Mark, Father Lagrange shows that Our Lord did not adopt this peculiar view ; that He announced as imminent a spiritual reign of God on earth and distinguished it not only from the heavenly kingdom into which souls enter at death, but from the final phase of God's reign which would be inaugurated when He came to judge the world. The Commentary is not wholly occupied with this theory. It takes up the teaching of Our Lord concerning Himself, Who is the messianic King and the Son of God ; and it treats of other questions raised by the Modernistic controversy ; it is a calm, objective study of all the principal statements of the earliest biography of Our Lord which has come down to us. One of the interesting points made in this Commentary is that St. Mark's christology does not differ very notably from St. John's. Father Lagrange defends in a very convincing way the unity and consistency of the Gospel in opposition to such critics as Professor Bacon of Yale.

Some Recent Books

The commentaries on Romans and Galatians are still occupied with very up-to-date questions; the latter especially is occupied with polemics against M. Loisy, who has discovered new aspects of the divergencies between Paul and James, and has come across the interesting "fact" that the Apostle of the Gentiles did not really get the view-point of his refractory converts. But these commentaries will be of service more particularly to those who have not lost interest in the old questions about justifying faith, good works, and merit. In matters of interpretation, Father Lagrange has not hesitated to acknowledge that he has profited a great deal by the very works the historical and theological conclusions whereof he combats. It may seem rather strange, at first sight, that Luther's interpretation receives such very serious attention, and that we are required to read another refutation of Lutheranism. This is not due exclusively to the fact that Father Lagrange was writing at a period when Protestants were celebrating the fourth centenary of the Reformer, nor to any delusion about the number of Lutherans of the old school. Lutheran views do still influence non-Catholic works on theology in a most astonishing way. Even the *International Critical Commentary* on Romans, by Professors Sanday and Headlam, is "too much inclined towards Protestant interpretation, especially in the matter of justification."* The theology of St. Paul, more perhaps than any other system, must be placed in the clear light of its historical setting. Luther discovered his pseudo-mysticism in St. Paul by interpreting the Apostle's denunciations of the Pharisees' doctrine of the possibility of attaining justification by their own human efforts as if they were addressed to Christians in the state of grace, and by similar historical blunders. Lack of sufficient attention to history has allowed many modern scholars to attribute to St. Paul

* The present writer has combined and translated in a booklet, entitled *Luther on the Eve of His Revolt* (The Cathedral Library Association, New York), a number of studies published by Father Lagrange on Luther's commentary on Romans, on the personality of the commentator, on the way in which he travestied the doctrinal system of St. Paul.

Father Lagrange's Works

the creation of that doctrinal system which he so explicitly sets forth as the teaching of the Master, and which he supposes shared in by the already widespread Christian society of his day. Father Lagrange constantly throws the light of history upon statements which are obscure chiefly to those who do not realize the circumstances in which they were uttered.

In the foreword of his latest book, on the meaning of Christianity according to German exegesis, Father Lagrange apologizes for the haste in which he had to write and for the imperfections incident to his absence from his beloved library of St. Stephen's Biblical School in Jerusalem; but the reader soon perceives that the book is not the outcome of the work of the few months in which it was written, but of years of patient, painstaking editing of the "recensions" and the "bulletin" of the *Revue Biblique*. Its appearance is an event which will be of great interest to those who have learned in the Palestinian class-room of this modern Jerome, or in reading his writings, to appreciate his courage in attacking the big problems of the day, his boldness ever tempered by religious submission to the Church in handling them, his care to study documents at first hand, his power to exhibit their contents in an original and striking way, and the sympathetic habit of mind which enables him to read understandingly the writings of others and to assimilate what is of value in them.

After exposing with confident lucidity the system of interpretation of the New Testament which Luther opposed to the traditional system of the Church, Father Lagrange denounces the vices of hermeneutics of the father of Protestantism—vices which were to infect his children down to the latest generation. As an exegete, Luther gave undue weight to a few selected texts which appeared to fit in with his own dark views of the radical and incurable corruption of human nature and human activity, and with his own optimistic views of the possibility of union between a sinful soul and a holy God. He did not, moreover, as has often been

Some Recent Books

shown since the days of Bossuet, hesitate to contradict himself when unfaithfulness to truth seemed opportune in his war against the Pope. Luther is now venerated in his native land chiefly as the patron of the *Los von Rom* movement; but in his one-sidedness and opportunism, he might well be regarded as the patron of the successive schools of rationalistic critics in Germany, down to very recent times. There was another reason for beginning the story of German Protestant exegesis with Luther. It is very interesting to notice, as Father Lagrange's exposition proceeds, that the peculiar interpretations of Luther are abandoned one after the other by Protestant exegetes. If we were to ask one of the members of the "Judeo-pagan syncretic school," which is now uttering the latest and only truthful verdicts of science about Christ and His work, which was more nearly right, Luther or the Church, in the interpretation of the texts of the New Testament, he would not hesitate to answer that it was the Church. The Catholic was right, he would assure us, in holding that, according to St. Paul, real, not imputative, righteousness was communicated by God to the faithful soul, the gift of God was of a wondrous, transforming nature, Baptism and the Eucharist were real sacraments infusing grace *ex opere operato*. He differs from the Catholic only in exaggerating what he calls the "magical" effects of their action.

One might leave it to the latest partisans of the uncontrolled interpretation of the Bible to refute their predecessors; and the same might be said of the successive schools of deists, naturalists, rationalists. This is the method which Father Fillion mainly relies on in his *Etapas du rationalisme dans ses attaques contre les évangiles et la vie de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ* (1911). But Father Lagrange has endeavoured to indicate, at least summarily, the arguments he is wont to employ against the various systems of exegesis which he sets forth. And this is not useless. After a system, as a whole, has been refuted, it still continues to affect not

Father Lagrange's Works

only the ill-informed, but even scholars who have recognized its weakness. The mythical system of Strauss, for instance, is now held by nobody in its completeness. But its main idea, conferring unlimited creative power upon the collective consciousness of the early Christians, is still the base of all rationalistic interpretation of the Gospels. Father Lagrange had already dealt with this system in the introduction of the commentary to St. Mark; here he again points out the impossibility of an evolution which does not start with something more than the rationalist is willing to put at the beginning of Christianity, and the impossibility of any transforming development, given the historical circumstances of the early Church.

When we begin the study of German Protestant exegesis with Luther, we might naturally expect more than the few pages which Father Lagrange devotes to the German exegetes who lived between Luther and Reimarus, those old "orthodox" interpreters who have now few representatives in the universities, but who still nourish the piety of many an honest "pastor" and of multitudes of simple souls within and without the Fatherland. It is here that Father Lagrange could have best made us realize the differences between his own exegesis and that which is based on a too strict concept of inspiration, a concept not exclusively Protestant. But he has preferred to steer clear of controversy with Catholics; the interpretation of the New Testament which he constantly keeps before us, as he sets forth successive and varying interpretations of dissenters, is one in which all Catholics agree. This "synthetic," "traditional" interpretation is explicitly vindicated in the first lecture, in which it is pointed out that a society, such as history shows the Church to have been from the beginning, would not have accepted the New Testament books if they contained a gospel different from that which she had received from the Apostles, and that it is reasonable to suppose that the living tradition of such a Church should have retained their true meaning. W. S. R.

Some Recent Books

SIR VALENTINE CHIROL has issued a slight memorial wreath to Sir Cecil Spring-Rice (John Murray) of which we lament to say that it is insufficient as a vindication and in bulk. Mr. Balfour's posthumous appreciation, which it includes, was unfortunately written too late to reach the Ambassador's eye, which is generally the case with tributes written after the event. Mr. Balfour recognizes the "unfailing judgment and unwearied forbearance" with which Spring-Rice steered his course, and the conduct which "largely contributed to preventing any trace of international friction which might have impeded or impaired the President's policy."

It was a pity that some word of cheer could not have reached him from the Foreign Office during those long months, when "a single false step" would have been fatal. The immense difficulty and delicacy of his position will probably never be realized by his critics. The aggressive or the subtle *rôle* would have failed equally. He never cultivated that appearance of obtrusive influence so dear to Foreign Offices. An Ambassador in Washington should avoid making or appearing to make history. It was almost necessary to his success to appear a failure himself or at least of little weight with the American administration, which both in peace and war has to show itself clear of British entanglements, to retain popular confidence. Under the tone and manner of the submissive official, he avenged himself with literary irony and the sadness of real humour. He made no effort to counter the overawing contempt of a Bernstorff or to imitate the placid intrigues of a Dumba, leaving the sardonic supposition that such leading lights of the profession were far above him. People were welcome to attribute his attitude to nervousness, gentility or incompetence. He declined to cut grand diplomatic figures. In spite of admonitions and queries from the other side he maintained his view and kept his flag flying until it was lowered at half-mast to himself.

He did well in realizing the impossibilities of his position instead of stirring up doubtful potentialities. He was not aware that he was the first British Envoy to be

Sir Cecil Spring-Rice

a *persona grata* with the American people as a whole. He only sensed the American feeling (which is similar to that of the cynic toward the aged) in regard to British officials, that they should be neither seen nor heard. He barely kept himself in the public view at all, and at the zenith of his career he stepped quickly into the background, leaving the available hosannas to Mr. Balfour. In those international shunting and coupling operations which followed the American entry into the war, he was content to serve as a passive link, whose service was always better than that of a clumsy buffer or faulty signal.

He had splashed no eddies in the maelstrom of American opinion, nor had he invoked the tide which lifted the country off her moorings. It came from without in the wash of the torpedo, but he had kept the path clear. There was no breakwater of a maladroit British propaganda to check its force. He had stayed well out of the way of the President. That he had contrived no personal pull on Wilson proved the height of diplomatic wisdom. When the President was slowly making up his mind to play Protagonist, he knew that he must not seem even to aspire to the *rôle* of Deuteragonist. He was content to be the stylus when Wilson was stylist. With humble but indescribable emotions he betook himself to the Capital to hear Wilson, as he said, deliver judgment on Germany as solemnly as a judge condemning to death. His work was then over, the impossible had been achieved and he was prepared to resign. His work was so obvious that there was no need to offer him one of those curious honours by which unsuccessful but gallant servants of the Crown are invited to change their names. The rapid exigencies of the hour made his presence necessary until the New Year, when he was somewhat abruptly given notice without the least public recognition of his services. The cutting short of his official career need not have been a tragedy or a disappointment to any but his sensitive self. He had achieved the most important diplomatic exploit to the credit of the Foreign Office during the war, and no one could take the honour or the fact from him, but he

Some Recent Books

naturally felt the terms of his notice to quit. It is painful to recall his anguish as the pent-up anxiety and sorrow and strain of his tenure came to the surface. The project to banquet him and mark his departure by demonstration not only of friends, but of sympathy from elements seldom friendly to England, he waived, asking in a pathetic letter to be allowed to depart in silence and darkness. He died a few hours after his successor had been received by the President, as his memorial at Eton says, "*cum denique sociasset Americanos nobis contra Germanos felix obiit.*"

Sir Valentine's summary of his career tending toward the climax at Washington is valuable biography, while the mystic address delivered a few days before death at Ottawa is Spring-Rice's best and lasting testament. He appealed to the national flag not as an imperial emblem, but dissolved into its original crosses "different in form, colour and history," and not unmeaningly he spoke of the Cross of St. Patrick. For during his tenure he touched the high-water mark of friendliness with Irish America. Few persons could know his agony of mind after the Irish Rising, or what he suffered behind the mask of official interpretation. As an official he could not save England's prestige, and as an Irishman he found himself caught between the idealism of one race and the blundering of another. His whole work was imperilled, but he made his way, permitting himself only one terrible *mot*. He realized that the future of the world as far as it is dependent on Irish, American and English agreement was at stake, and in that desolate No-man's land, where the interests of all three should meet, he died, but his fingers held the threads without which those who follow him can blend no lasting strand.

S. L.





The TABLET

A Weekly Newspaper and Review

PRICE: SIXPENCE

THE TABLET, founded in 1840, was acquired in 1868 by Cardinal Vaughan, who determined to supply to Catholic readers a paper expressing their own lofty ideals.

ITS reputation is established as that of a Catholic weekly with the scholarly authority of a Review as well as the lighter interest of a Newspaper.

IN breadth of outlook, in current learning, and in literary merit, THE TABLET provokes comparison with any of its non-Catholic contemporaries, and of late it has won fresh laurels in many quarters on account of its powerful articles on War topics and its capable summary of each week's happenings.

THE Publisher will be happy to forward a Specimen Copy of the current issue to any reader of THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

THE Subscription is 28/- per annum inland, and 30/- per annum overseas (post free).

The TABLET

19, Henrietta Street, London, W.C.

